This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Digitized by Google

Per. 111b. d. 4
1872-3

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE UNITARIAN & UNIVERSALIST MISSIONARY:

EDITED

BY HENRY WILLIAMSON, DUNDEE.

"And Jesus answered him, The first of all the Commandments is, Hear, O! Israel: THE LORD OUR GOD IS ONE LORD."—Mark xii. 29.

"One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves."—*Tennyson.*

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

VOLUME I.

LONDON: HALL & CO., 25 PATERNOSTER ROW.
MANCHESTER: JOHNSON & RAWSON, 89 MARKET STREET.
EDINBURGH: HENRY ROBINSON, GREENSIDE STREET.
DUNDEE: WM. SMITH, NETHERGATE.
BELFAST: THE UNITARIAN DEPOSITORY.
LIVERPOOL: MRS LEIGHTON, WEST DERBY ROAD.

1872.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

PAGE

A Father's Advice to his Son . . . 6
A Few of the Laws Relating to Religous Affairs in England, Arranged Chronologically 40, 54, 71
A Few Thoughts on an Endless Hell . . 34
A Good Method for Distributing Unitarian Publications 75
A Jew Speaking for his Race in Edinburgh and Dundee 143
A Layman's Ministry at Barnard Castle . 20
An Address to Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen 83
An Orthodox Concession 19
Answers to our Questions on the Bible 28, 61, 84
A Parable 58
A Rejoinder to a Reply, being a Portion of a Discourse 56

Balaam and the Ass 93
"Beware of the Leaven of the Pharisees" . 93

Christianity in Common Life 25
Christ's Glory with the Father before the World Was 70
Correspondence . . 27, 92, 112, 120, 155

Eastern Manners and Customs . . 79, 107
Eve and the Serpent 2
Everlasting Destruction 3

Faith—Its Nature and Value 5

Gems of Thought from Dr Chapin . . 43
Gilbert Wakefield—How he left the Church of England 9
Greek Testament Class—First Lesson . 12
... ... Second Lesson . 29
... ... Third Lesson . 42
... ... Fourth Lesson . 59
... ... Fifth Lesson . 74
... ... Sixth Lesson . 86
... ... Seventh Lesson . 98
... ... Eighth Lesson . 111
... ... Ninth Lesson . 122
... ... Tenth Lesson . 134
... ... Eleventh Lesson . 147
... ... Twelfth Lesson . 156

Indirect Attacks upon the Doctrine of Hell Torments 58

Jeroboam's Golden Calves 126
John i., 1—4, ... 22

PAGE

Jonah and the Whale 108
Justification 33
Justification by Works 67
Justification by Faith 82

Liberal Judaism 125
Love and Truth 129

Missionary Work 14, 15, 16, 31, 46, 47, 48, 63, 64, 75, 87, 88, 112

Notes on John i., 1—17 45
Notes of Progress 88, 99, 100, 123, 135, 148
Notices . 48, 64, 76, 100, 135, 148, 158

One Religion 85
One Way to Help in the Sunday School . 119
On Religious Insincerity 128
On the Age of the Book of Job . . . 51
On the History of the Doctrine of Original Sin 103
On the Jehovistic and Elohistic Writers . 1
On the Pharisees and Sadducees . . 116
On the Purpose of the Book of Job . . 117
Opinions on the Nature of Christ . . 91
Orthodox Doctrines Denied by Unitarians
1. The Word Inspiration of the Bible 17
2. The Trinity 49
3. The Existence of the Devil . . 77
4. The Deity of Christ . . . 105
5. Original Sin 113
Our Purpose 44
Our Questions on the Bible . 11, 41, 73

Piety at Home 155

Religious Doctrines Believed by Unitarians
1. The Right and Duty of Individual Judgment 7
2. The Existence of God 37
3. The Immortality of Man . . . 95
4. The Love and Providence of God . 140
Repentance 10

Saul and the Witch of Endor 129
Sayings of the Rev. James Martineau . 124
Selections from Writings of Rev. W. E. Channing, D.D. 136
Sin Set forth under various Aspects by the Bible Writers 127, 139

Digitized by Google

PAGE

The Arguments from the Scriptures used by the Ancient Unitarians . . . 53
The Atonement Doctrine in Several Forms 91
The Bible in the Pulpit 66
The Bible when Intelligently Read . . 137
The Book of Job 68
The Book of Ruth 39
The Broad Church in Scotland . . . 62
The Broad Creed 32
The Canon of the New Testament . . 89
The Case of the Rev. W. Knight of Dundee 101, 121, 131, 151
The Deity of Jesus 80
The Dissenters' Objections to the Church of England's Doctrines 84
The Doctrines of Original Sin . . . 85
The Folly of Creeds 118
The Life and Vigour Awakened by Controversy 35
The Missionary Work of the Unitarian Church 65
The Old Testament and the Atonement Doctrines 153

PAGE

The Only-Begotten Son 23
The Penalty on not Acting up to Convictions 69
The Second and Third Epistles of John . 23
The Sunday School 14, 27, 44, 72, 85, 99, 146, 157
The Ten Tribes of Israel 152
The True Theology 155
The Unitarian Mission 132
To our Subscribers and Friends . . . 160
To our Readers 12

Unitarian Bookstalls 55
Unitarian Christianity in Scotland . . 144
Unitarian Statistics 40
Universalism 32

What is meant by End of the World . . 109
Who are the Sceptics 138
Who are to do the Master's Work . . 30
Who Paid for the London Mansion House 94
Works 21

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

No. 1. JANUARY 1872. PRICE 1D.

ON THE JEHOVISTIC AND ELOHISTIC WRITERS.

OUR Readers may not all be familiar with the distinction which has been pointed out by critics between the Jehovistic and Elohistic portions of the Bible; so called because the one set of writers gave to the Almighty the name of Jehovah, and the others never use that word, but name him Elohim or God.

If, however, the reader will open his Bible, he will read in Genesis i. that "God created the heavens and the earth." But in chapter ii., in the authorised version, he will read that the "LORD God created them;" and he will observe that the two accounts of the creation are not in every respect the same. The writer who calls the Almighty God, or, in the Hebrew, Elohim, is not the same writer as the one that uses the word Lord, or Jehovah, as it is in the Hebrew. From these Hebrew words one is called the Elohistic narrative, and the other the Jehovistic narrative; and the distinction between the two is also found in other parts of the Bible.

The German critics have, for the most part, thought that the name of Jehovah is the more modern of the two names; but it seems more probable that the names belonged to two portions of the country rather than to two portions of time. The name of Jehovah probably belonged to the tribe of Judah, of which we know very little before the time of David; and it was not used by the northern tribes, who, before that time, were the most important, and who, indeed, are the only tribes of which we have any history before the establishment of the monarchy, and while the nation was governed by judges.

Among the northern tribes the Almighty was called by the name of Elohim, *God*, or Baal, *Lord;* and it must be remarked that the word Baal by no means belonged to the idolators only, although, from its being used by idolators, it was, after a time, strongly objected to by the worshippers of the true God.

It was in the history of the creation that the distinction was probably first remarked between the two classes of writers. Thus, as said above, in the 1st chapter of Genesis we have an account of the creation of the world by God; and in the next chapter, beginning at verse 4, we have another and different account of the creation by Jehovah God.

In the life of Noah we have two very clear instances of Jehovistic passages, which are clearly after-insertions into the earlier narrative. Thus, beginning with Genesis vi. 9, and ending with chapter ix. 25, we have an account of God's dealing with Noah, and telling him to make an Ark, and to take into it one male and one female of every living thing, in order to keep the races of animals alive. To this history, chapter vii. 1-5 is clearly an after-addition,—an inserted passage. In this Jehovah tells Noah, that of the clean beasts he shall take in seven each. And a second inserted passage is, chap. viii. 20-22, in which we read that Noah, on coming out of the ark, built an altar to Jehovah, and sacrificed thereupon one of every kind of clean beasts and clean fowl. By so doing, it will be observed, he would have destroyed the whole of these races of animals if he had saved alive only one pair of each,

Digitized by Google

as ordered by God. Thus, it will be clearly seen that the original narrative about Noah's life is Elohistic; while these two passages, which bear traces of being after-additions, are Jehovistic.

In the same way chapter vi. 1-7, which precedes the life of Noah, is another Jehovistic insertion; as, also, is chapter ix. 26-27. Of these two it may be shown that the first is a very early addition, because it is quoted in another place; while the second is a very late edition. These passages are enough to explain to our readers this interesting question about the Jehovistic and Elohistic passages in the Bible, and the manner in which the enquiry is carried on.

EVE AND THE SERPENT.

NO greater mistake in Biblical exposition was ever committed than that which represents the serpent which is alleged to have tempted Eve, not as a simple reptile, but, moreover, as tenanted by an almost omnipotent and omniscient evil spirit, called Satan. Now, it is a fact which cannot be disputed, that, while the word Satan does occasionally present itself in the Old Testament, it only occurs as its original meaning of *adversary*, and is never, in the earlier books especially, applied to any being at all resembling the comparatively modern *Devil*, but is used to designate ordinary human beings, as in 2 Sam. xix. 22; or angels, as in Numbers xxii. 22, 32, and Job i. 6; and, once at least, Jehovah himself, as in 1 Chron. xxi. 1, compared with 2 Sam. xxiv. 1. The fact is, that the Hebrews knew nothing of an Evil Spirit contending with Jehovah for the government of the universe till after the Babylonish captivity (say nine hundred years subsequent to the death of Moses), and that they *imported* it into their own religion from that of their Persian masters. Such being the case, the author, whoever he was, of the account of what is called the Temptation and Fall of our first parents, being ignorant, as he must have been, of the very existence of a personal Devil, cannot possibly have intended his readers to understand that such a being inhabited the body of the serpent, and spoke and acted through that body. Our conclusion is, accordingly, that it was simply a serpent, and nothing more or less than a serpent, which the writer himself intended to represent as soliciting our primeval mother to transgression.

Nor does it militate against this conclusion that the writer believed the serpent to possess the power of speech; for the Hebrews, down even to the time of Christ (as may be seen in Josephus, where treating of this very transaction), held that *all* the lower animals were originally gifted with the same faculty. It requires no appeal to comparative anatomy to convince any modern enquirer that, in this matter, not only Josephus, but the author of this portion of Genesis, was unquestionably mistaken.

Another proof that an actual reptile, and not an evil spirit in the form of a reptile, was considered by the writer to be the tempter of Eve, is afforded by the special punishment which was inflicted upon him; —"Upon thy belly shalt thou go . . . all the days of thy life." Here we find stated the notion of the author, that the serpent originally *walked erect;* for, if he did not, how could it be a punishment to be compelled for the future to go wriggling and grovelling along the ground? As before, no appeal to comparative anatomy can, in these days and lands, be needed to convince us that in this particular also, the writer was mistaken.

As it is impossible, then, to accept the idea of a serpent speaking and walking erect (suppositions which may have presented no difficulty in the infancy of our race), we are compelled to regard the whole of the account in Genesis of the Temptation and Fall of Man as *unhistorical;* as not a relation of actual occurrence; as no more than the attempt of some unknown speculator among the early Hebrews to account, in a highly-figurative, and perhaps allegorical manner, for the introduction of moral evil into the world. We are not warranted in attaching to it any importance in matters of doctrine; and certainly not in making it the support of such dark theological figments as those of original sin and innate depravity,—figments which are subversive, not only of the Divine mercy, but even of the Divine justice.

R. E. B. MACLELLAN.

Digitized by Google

EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION.

EXPOSITION.

"Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power."—2 Thess. i. 6—10.

INQUIRY into the import of this passage may be comprehended in four particulars,—namely: *Who? When? Where? What?*—that is, 1st, *Who* are the persons to whom the judgment of the text applies? 2d, *When* was that judgment to take place? 3d, *Where* was it to be inflicted? 4th, In *what* was it to consist?

I. *Who* are the persons to whom the judgment of the text applies? This question is answered by the context, in which three (and only three) classes are mentioned or alluded to:

1st, Paul, Sylvanus and Timotheus—the first of whom wrote the epistle, in which he was joined by the other two.

2d, The believers in the Christian church at Thessalonica, to whom the epistle was addressed; and

3d, Those who troubled and persecuted the believers referred to. Proved by the following citations—but the reader will do well to peruse the entire connexion:

"Paul and Sylvanus and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians . . . . *we* ourselves glory in *you* for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations, that ye endure . . . Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation TO THEM THAT TROUBLE YOU," &c.

Here we have the three classes; and it is perfectly plain that the judgment of the text had specific application to the third class, namely, *those who persecuted and troubled the believing Christians in the church at Thessalonica.*

In inquiring, Who were those persecutors? the fact is immediately suggested, that the principal and most virulent opponents of Christianity were *the unbelieving Jews.* When Paul visited Thessalonica, he had personal experience of their hostility; and they followed him to Berea in their fierce persecuting zeal, Acts xvii. 1—13. And the Thessalonians are reminded of the sufferings experienced at the hands of their Jewish countrymen, who were akin in spirit and life to those "who both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets," and had persecuted the Christians in Judea, 1 Thess. ii. 14, 15.

II. *When* was the judgment of the text to take place? This question is also answered by the context—namely, "*When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven* with his mighty angels."

Consult Luke xvii 30, 31: "Even thus shall it be in the day *when the Son of man is revealed*, [namely, *from heaven.*] In that day, he which shall be on the house-top, and his staff in the house, let him not come to take it away: and he that is in the field, let him likewise not return back." If any one doubts that this relates to the siege and overthrow of Jerusalem, as predicted by our Saviour, let him read corresponding and parallel descriptions in Matthew xxiv. 15—21.

Pursuing the latter quotation, verses 29 to 35 included, treat of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory, and with his angels; and all this is expressly restricted to the then existing generation. See also Matthew xvi. 27, 28: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."

Let it not here be objected that no event occurred corresponding to this description during the lifetime of any who heard Christ utter those words. The prediction is clear, and the time positively determined; and the objector should rather abandon his false notion of what Christ meant, than to charge the Divine Teacher with prophesying what did not come to pass.

There is another circumstance worthy of note connected with the text. Paul treats of the Thessalonian Christians obtaining *rest* from tribulation at the very time that *tribulation* was visited upon their persecutors,—see verses 6 and 7. Will any one pretend that those believers are still suffering the tribulations and persecutions

Digitized by Google

under which they manifested the patience and faith for which the apostle commended them?

III. Where was the judgment of the text to be inflicted? The answer is ready: "*From* the presence of the Lord, and *from* the glory of his power."

In one sense the presence of the Lord is universal—as may be seen in Ps. cxxxix. 7: "Whither shall I go from thy spirit, or whither shall I flee from thy presence," &c. But this is evidently not the sense of the phrase in the text.

When Cain was sentenced to be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth, he "went out from the presence of the Lord." Genesis iv. 16. There is here a located sense of the phrase in question; and that located sense was, by the later Jews, appropriated to the land of Canaan, especially to Judea. Accordingly we find that "Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish *from the presence of the Lord*, and went down to Joppa." There he took shipping for "Tarshish, *from the presence of the Lord*," Jonah i. 3. Subsequently, he prayed unto God, and said, "I am cast out of thy sight; yet I will look again toward thy holy temple,"—for there he supposed the presence of the Lord to abide, chap. ii. 4.

Conformably to this usage of language, the Lord declared that he would cast the Jews out of his sight, as he had already cast out all their brethren, even the whole seed of Ephraim, Jeremiah vii. 15. This entire chapter denounces destruction to Jerusalem, the desolation of the whole land, and the captivity of the people. And this, in Scriptural phraseology, was *destruction from the presence of the Lord.*

See, for example, 2 Kings xiii. 23: "The Lord had compassion on them . . . . and would not destroy them, neither cast he them out from his presence as yet." Nevertheless, they persisted in evil, and that very judgment was inflicted. 2 Kings xxiv. 20: "For through the anger of the Lord it came to pass in Jerusalem and Judah, until he had cast them out from his presence, that Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon."

During the 70 years' captivity in Babylon, the Jews were destroyed *from the presence of the Lord*, and from his glorious power. And a similar fate was denounced in Jeremiah xxiii. 39, 40: "I will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave unto your fathers, and *cast you out of my presence;* and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten."

IV. In *what* was that judgment to consist? The plain answer is, In *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord. The judgment was national as the instrument of individual retribution.

Jesus said to his disciples, "In your patience possess ye your souls. And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them that be in Judea flee into the mountains . . . . for these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. . . . They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations." The disciples were told to watch closely for the signs of these events at the coming of the Son of man: "And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." Luke xxi. 19-33.

The redemption here mentioned is the *rest* promised to the Thessalonian believers. That redemption, that rest, was obtained when the power of the persecutor was overwhelmed by the desolation of Jerusalem, the destruction of the nation, and the captivity into which such of the people were led as escaped the edge of the sword. And thus the persecuting Jews were banished from that presence of the Lord from which Jonah desired to flee; and, like that disobedient prophet, their descendants say, "We are cast out of thy sight; but we will look toward thy holy temple."

If it be objected that the Jews at Thessalonica could have had no part in the judgment on Jerusalem, and that therefore the text could not apply to them —this is our reply:

1. Josephus informs us that the siege and overthrow of Jerusalem transpired at the annual feast—at which time multitudes of the Jews, from all parts of the world, were congregated in "the holy city." Eleven hundred thousand perished, and the remainder were led away captive. The principal persecutors resident at Thessalonica were doubtless present at this feast, and were involved in one or other of these calamities.

2. The ruin of Jerusalem and the utter

Digitized by Google

destruction of the national polity, was an event in which every Jew throughout the earth was interested. Theirs was a religious government. All power was concentrated in, and all authority derived from, Jerusalem. The rod of the oppressor was broken by the extinction of all this glory and dominion; and they who aforetime persecuted and troubled the Christians, at Thessalonica and elsewhere, were visited with a tribulation which shall terminate only when blindness shall be removed from the house of Jacob.

A. C. THOMAS.

FAITH—ITS NATURE AND VALUE.

FAITH is a Biblical term, and represents a Biblical reality. To such an extent does the reality pervade the Bible, that it may be considered one of its essentials. Other human states of mind are mentioned in the Bible. No one occurs so often as faith. Moreover, to faith is ascribed in Scripture the highest spiritual results. Hence, a right idea of faith is necessary to a correct understanding of the Bible. Now, the Bible, from first to last, is a religious book. I speak of religion here in contradistinction to dogma. They are essentially different. Religion is God's voice in conscience and in history. Springing up in our instinctive sentiments, it is intuitional in character, spontaneous in operation; and having God for its object as well as its source, it grows with our growth, and strengthens with our strength, under the co-working of God's providence; and filling the soul with child-like awe and child-like love, makes God's will supreme, and God's law and aims its law and aims. Consequently, it has eyes to see with, and power to work with; and, when well instructed and duly controled by knowledge and reason, it bestows spiritual power alike sanctifying, enriching, and ennobling. Such is religion. Dogma is something very different. The word dogma signifies a determination, a decision, a decree. In its nature, therefore, dogma implicates what is indeterminate, undecided, undeclared. It is, in consequence, an alternative opinion. Between this and that, it concludes that the one is false or heretical, the other true or orthodox. Historically regarded, dogmas are simply ecclesiastical opinions arrived at by one man or men in presence of this view of a subject entertained by him or them and that view of a subject entertained by others. Dogma, then, is an affair of the head. It is an outcome of a process of reasoning. Now, every process of reasoning is open to all the mistakes, errors, and false conclusions which are inherent as in language itself, so in its perpetually evanescent and shifting character, which is sometimes so marked that the final decision ensues from a logical condition totally different to that with which you began. Moreover, the chances of error are multiplied by the fact that dogmas have to do with topics of the darkest kind, such as fate, free-will, original sin, &c., and are perpetually engaged in trying to solve the insolvable by determining the How, why, and wherefore of the invisible world. Dogma, then, instead of being religion, is simply something about religion, and that something about religion which in its nature is indeterminable.

Since, then, the Bible is a thoroughly religious book, it is without dogma. This is so as a matter of fact. The Bible is not a repertory of human opinions or ecclesiastical decisions. It is essentially a revelation. It is God unveiled to the religious principle of his intelligent child. It is God speaking in man's spiritual nature. Of those disclosures and those words it is a human record. Consequently, the Bible has a human as well as a divine side. Instructive and impressive as coming from God, it is fallible as passing through a human channel; but inasmuch as it deals incessantly with moral qualities—and moral qualities are, of all human things, the most clear and certain,—so the Bible is the one sure guide to God, duty, life, and blessedness. In brief, the Bible is the Book of Christian Life—"*the* life" that is, the true and everlasting life of man here and hereafter. This it is in virtue of its bringing the teaching Father into contact with the teachable child.

The point of union is faith. Faith is the hand which lays hold of the offered bread and water of life, and lifts it to the thirsty lip and the hungry palate. As performing this office, faith is a faculty.

Digitized by Google

It is the faculty which sees that hand and receives its gifts. Faith is the eye of the soul. As such, when in its highest condition, it sees even God. (Matthew v. 8.) Its general function is to make the invisible visible, and the distant near. So is it described in the 11th chapter of Hebrews, all the instances of which, instead of being dogmatists or reasoners, are faithful because dutiful men and women, such as are to be met with still in cottage homes and village schools;—men and women whose sole work is to do and bear the will of God with devout and thankful hearts. And thus we are led to remark that faith is a natural, and as a natural, so a sound and healthy faculty. For what is this power which brings the remote near and transmutes the invisible into the visible—but the power which in ordinary life enables men and women to live for to-morrow as well as for to-day, and so to live for eternity as well as for time. As held and exercised by the great ones of our race, it is the power to see effects in their causes, the fruits and rewards of enterprise in its seed, and so to make life holy and grand by filling it with wise designs and virtuous deeds, with benevolent and patriotic undertakings. It was faith which led Jesus from Nazareth to the Jordan, from Gethsemane to the cross, and which lifted him from the cross to the right hand of God. A life of faith is a life of trust, beneficence, and bliss. For this faculty is also a power. It was the power which brought the prodigal son back to his father's home. The power at first may be as small as a grain of mustard seed, but it is capable of growing and expanding into a majestic tree. All our moral and spiritual affections have in them an element of the infinite. And therefore Jesus said to the sinful woman, "Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace." (Luke vii. 50.) And yet the woman was "a sinner" (37th verse.) O, yes; but then "She loved much," (47.) "Wherefore, I say unto thee, her sins, which are many, are forgiven." What, then, is "a saving faith?" What? It is a "faith which worketh by love." (Gal. v. 6.) That forgiven woman's faith working by love, weak as she was, was strong enough to lead her to Christ,—and there she found the sympathy and succour she needed and desired. What, then, is a genuine faith? It is not belief in the Athanasian Creed; it is not belief in the Thirty-Nine Articles, nor in any set of opinions "framed by art and man's device." It is simply a yearning after God, after Christ, after good—the one real and permanent good, the good of our higher life. In other words it may be called our spiritual ideal. A genuine faith is to love God and serve man after the spirit and life of Christ. Indescribable is the value of such a faith, if only because it makes its happy possessor one with the Father and the Son, as well as with all the blessed ones of the Church universal.

JOHN R. BEARD.

A FATHER'S ADVICE TO HIS SON.

THE time draws nigh, dear John, that I must go the way from which none returns. I cannot take thee with me, I must leave thee in a world where good counsel is not superabundant. No one is born wise. Time and experience teach us to separate the grain from the chaff. I have seen more of the world than thou. It is not all gold, dear son, that glitters. I have seen many a star from heaven fall, and many a staff on which men have leaned, break. Therefore I give thee this advice, the result of my experience: Attach not thy heart to any transitory thing. The truth comes not to us, dear son, we must seek for it. That which you see, scrutinize carefully; and with regard to things unseen and eternal, rely on the Word of God. Search no one so closely as thyself. Within us dwells the judge who never deceives, and whose voice is more to us than the applause of the world, and more than all the wisdom of the Egyptians and Greeks. Resolve, my son, to do nothing to which this voice is opposed. When you think and project, strike on your forehead and ask for his counsel. He speaks at first low, and lisps as an innocent child; but if you honour his innocence, he gradually loosens his tongue and speaks more distinctly.

Despise not any religion; it is easy to despise, but it is much better to understand. Uphold truth when thou canst, and be willing for her sake to be hated; but know that thy individual cause is not the cause of truth, and beware that they are not confounded. Do good for thy own satisfaction, and care not what follows. Cause no grey hairs to any one; nevertheless, for the right, even grey hairs are to be disregarded. Help and give willingly when thou hast, and think no more of thyself for it; and if thou hast nothing, let thy hands be ready with a drink of cold water, and esteem thyself for that no less. Say not always what thou knowest, but know always what thou sayest. Not the apparently devout, but the truly devout man, respect, and go in his ways. A man who has the fear of God in his heart is like the sun, that shines and warms, though it does not speak. Do that which is worthy of recompense, and ask none. Reflect daily upon death, and seek the life which is beyond with a cheerful courage; and, further, go not out of the world without having testified by some good deed thy love and respect for the Author of Christianity.—*From the German.*

Digitized by Google

RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES BELIEVED BY UNITARIANS.

The Rev. JOHN WRIGHT, B.A., Bury.

No. 1.—THE RIGHT AND DUTY OF INDIVIDUAL JUDGMENT.

THE questions may reasonably be put to every man who has any belief about Religion, "*Why* do you believe? On what grounds have you come to the conclusions you hold?" Whenever a doubt or debate arises as to any theological opinion, those who argue the question together find it necessary to agree on some test to which it is to be submitted. For want of such an agreement, much religious controversy is practically fruitless, each party using its own method and neglecting to notice that of the other party. Our first step, in an enquiry after truth, must be to determine how the enquiry shall be conducted.

The religious world is divided into two great parties, to one or other of which every sect and every individual belongs. There are, *first*, those who adopt a creed because it is imposed upon them by some authority outside themselves; *second*, those who bring every assertion to the test of their own natural powers, and only believe that as to which each is thoroughly persuaded in his own mind. The former bow with implicit submission to the teachings of a church, a priest, or a book, and without venturing to investigate the claims made to exercise authority, receive as certainly true every doctrine thus presented to them. The latter seek to prove all things, and hold fast only what each has for himself tested and found trustworthy. The former let others think for them, the latter think for themselves. It is important to ascertain which of these two methods of proceeding is the right one.

What do we mean when we speak of an *individual* human being? What is it that separates him from all the other members of his race? It is that he possesses feelings, reason, conscience and will, which are his own, which cannot be rightfully taken from him, which cannot be exercised by another on his behalf. If all the rest of the world have a certain affection, *you* have it not, unless *you yourself* feel it. If men much wiser than you declare a thing to be true, *you* do not see the proof of it till *your own* reason is convinced. Whatever you may do, because you are commanded to do it, *you* do not regard it as a duty, until *your own* conscience urges its performance. No action is felt to be *your* action, unless *your own* will was exerted in doing it. Now, since these powers of our nature, which are acknowledged to be the highest and noblest parts of it, are the essence of individuality, the peculiar possessions of man which qualify him to speak of himself as an independent being, it is surely necessary that they should be employed on all subjects that are of importance. It is only by means of them that we can have any mental or spiritual possession really our own. To use them boldly, industriously, continually and universally, is the birthright of every MAN.

Each individual then has a *right* to judge for himself what is true and what is false, and to decide for himself how much or how little he shall believe. No fellow man can be justified in calling him to account for his belief, or in censuring him for his unbelief. All persecution for opinion is now generally condemned by the more civilised nations of the earth, and all social obloquy and popular prejudice against a man, because his convictions differ from those of the majority, should equally be abandoned. If any government or church or sect attempts to interfere with this use by an individual of his own inherent powers, he may justly say to them, "Mind your own business; I have as much right to my opinions as you have to yours, and for those opinions I am accountable to no human being."

It is only by such "individual judgment" that any belief that is worthy of the name can be arrived at. It is true that men often assent to assertions without inquiry, but when they do so, it is because the matter referred to is one as to which they have not time or ability to investigate.

Digitized by Google

But this tacit and thoughtless assent is not belief. Most of us receive in this way the truths of science; we give credit to them on the word of the great philosophers who have studied the subjects. But as soon as any one desires to gain true scientific knowledge, so that he himself may be a philosopher, he examines for himself, traces step by step the proofs on which science depends, and after this he holds the truths with a far deeper certainty than that which marked his previous blind assent to them. No one can feel himself able to face every argument that may be brought against his opinions, and to stand firm against every difficulty that may arise, as long as he entirely depends on the reports of the experiments and observations made by others; but when he has, by the use of his own power, tested the results and verified the conclusions, he has in consequence a conviction that cannot be shaken. In like manner with regard to Religion; in childhood we believe what we are told about it, but in manhood we should examine into the grounds and proofs of its doctrines, and he only has a belief that is truly his own, and that can be under all circumstances depended on, who has himself felt, thought, reasoned, and been convinced.

It follows from the possession of this right of free enquiry, that it is the *duty* of every one to exercise it. We may be too idle to do so. In that case we allow the precious instrument placed in our keeping to grow stiff and rusty for want of use, and must bear the penalty of losing what we refuse to employ. We may be timid, and fancy that it is dangerous to try to form our own opinions, lest we should make mistakes. In that case we must remain without opinions; but it would be better to have mistaken opinions truly our own and the result of investigation, than to continue simple echoes of the assertions of others. Nor need any one fear the consequences of free enquiry. If there is anything we are certain of, as to which we cannot doubt, it is our own existence and that of our own powers, and the right use of those powers must put us in a better position than the neglect of them. Those who, in the name of God, try to frighten men from reasoning about religion must think strangely of God, since they seem to suppose He has given man a reason merely that when used it may mislead him.

Each individual human being, whether man or woman, has a right and a duty to form individual religious opinions, by e use of the individual powers. But for this purpose we must use *all* the powers of our nature. Not only the reason, but also the conscience and the feelings have something to teach us on this subject. Our moral instincts, our spiritual aspirations, our felt wants and yearnings, not less than our logical conclusions, must be attended to. Those opinions which are thus arrived at, which are consonant with every part of our nature, which are founded on individual insight, experience and reasoning, are truly our *belief*—and it is those only who thus believe who have any opinions that deserve to be called their own.

But it must not be conceived that thus to judge for ourselves deprives us of all the advantage to be derived from the teachings of the past, or prevents our learning from those who are wiser, better, and holier than we are. We have to enlighten the reason, and educate the conscience, and purify the feelings, by means of all the instruction within our reach. Thus we may be taught truth which we should never otherwise have discovered, but we do not receive it as truth, if it is opposed to natural feeling or conscience or reason. Our own reason might not be able to find out the truth, but when it is exhibited to us, our reason confirms it, and hence it becomes an article of our belief. Thankfully do we welcome the teachings of the great men of every age, but they are teachers, not masters, helps, not authorities, they stimulate and do not supersede the activity of each individual.

There may be many different plans adopted for arriving at belief about religion among those who yet agree in gaining that belief, each man for himself. Even those who attach supreme importance to the traditions of a Church or the words of a book, may yet, to a certain extent, exercise individual judgment,—namely, if they take care to satisfy themselves, *first*, that there is proof that the Church or the book can teach nothing but truth. But it is noticeable that the greatest teachers of religion have not claimed from their followers a blind and unreasoning assent to their words, but have appealed to the verifying faculty inherent in each human mind and soul. Jesus Christ said "why even of your own selves judge ye not

Digitized by Google

what is right?" Paul declared "I write as unto wise men, judge ye what I say—try all things, hold fast that which is good—let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

Unitarians teach and practise, without exception or reservation, the right and duty of individual judgment. Among them there is no verbal creed, no set of articles to which either ministers or congregations are called on to assent, but each separate person forms his own opinions for himself, with such help and instruction as he can obtain, and is considered accountable for his opinions solely to his own conscience and to God. The consequence is that there is among Unitarians difference of opinion on many minor points, while they are sufficiently agreed on fundamental principles to be able to join in common worship. But this agreement is the result of each of them having for himself arrived at these principles on conviction, not of any outward restraint or any submission to human authority. Such a course as this places religion on its true foundation, shows it to be in accordance with the natural feelings and conscience and reason, and enables every man to be "thoroughly persuaded in his own mind."

GILBERT WAKEFIELD—HOW HE LEFT THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

IT was about the year 1778 that Gilbert Wakefield, then 22 years of age, subscribed the 39 Articles, and was ordained a Deacon of the Church of England. And during the next twelve months, in a curacy, first at Stockton and then at Liverpool, he attempted to reconcile his conscience to his position. But at the end of the year, in thorough dissatisfaction at what he had done, he left the Church to work among Dissenters, and accepted the post of classical tutor in the Warrington Academy—an institution which, after more than one change of place and of name, is now known among us as the Manchester New College, London. Looking back in after years, with regret, upon his signing the Articles, Wakefield wrote—

"Even then, I was so little satisfied with the requisition of subscription, and the subjects of that subscription themselves, that I have since regarded this as *the most disingenuous action of my life;* utterly incapable of palliation or apology; and I hold it out accordingly to the severest reprobation of every honest reader."

"I reconciled myself," he adds, "to a temporary acquiescence by help of that stale, shameless sophistry, usually employed on these occasions, that so young a man could not be expected to form a competent judgment on these points at present; that the supposition under which subscription was imposed, conceded a liberty to examine afterwards more maturely; that some of the wisest and best of men had continued conscientious members of the Church of England through life after an examination of controverted points, and other pretences of interested reasoners, which my ingenuity, not often exercised in these palliating hypocrisies, can not now suggest, even with the help of memory."

The quarter of a century in which Gilbert Wakefield passed his youth was a time of the stirring of men's minds on religious questions. His father was a clergyman of the town of Nottingham; but among his fellow students at the University of Cambridge he met with a spirit of free inquiry that was new to him. On the other side of him were opposite influences. Dr Powell—one of the Broad-Church clergymen of the day—had just preached his accommodating sermon on the subject of subscription to the Articles. His reasonings were only too generally admired and adopted. When Archdeacon Paley soon after wrote his book on Moral Philosophy, we are told that he made use of these sophistries, with further additions of his own, in what Gilbert Wakefield has justly blamed as a "Shuffling Chapter on Subscription."

There is a strength and clearness in the language of those that act conscientiously that nothing else can give. "We are in no danger," says Gilbert Wakefield in the preface to his Enquiry into the Opinions of the Christian Writers of the First Centuries concerning the Person of Jesus Christ, "We are in no danger, God be thanked, of chains and martyrdom; but are still obnoxious to temptations, less formidable indeed, but more seducing. We must be faithful unto death if we wish to receive a crown of life."

Digitized by Google

REPENTANCE.

By Charles H. Brigham.

WHAT is the meaning of this word Repentance, which the New Testament writers use so often? The prophet Ezekiel explains repentance as the spiritual turning away from sin; but there is probably more meaning in the New Testament word, than in its Hebrew synonym. The literal analysis of the Greek word *metanoia* would make it mean change of mind, change of thought, change of opinion. But it really implies something more than this. The common colloquial expression "I have changed my mind," comes nearer to the biblical thought. It is not so much a change of thought and opinion, as a change of will and purpose, a change of inclination, a change of spiritual direction. It is not in a new view of duty or expediency, but in a new resolution. We repent when we turn around in the spirit, when our way is changed, when we turn away from our sin, forsake it, denounce it, abhor it; when mind and heart agree in setting it aside.

And in the change of mind and purpose there are two elements. In the first place, there is the clear knowledge of the sin of which we repent. It must be an actual thing, an individual offence, a sin of our own. We cannot repent of abstract sin, of sin in general, or of the principle of sin. We cannot repent of liability to sin, cannot repent of a depraved nature, cannot repent of what parents have given us, or what has come as our inheritance in race and blood. We may confess that we are sinners in the fall of Adam; but we cannot repent of Adam's fall, however troubled and pained we may be by our share in it. It is just as impossible for the soul to repent of inherited sin, as it is to repent of the sin of another soul now living. We may be involved in the sins of ancestors,—of persecuting Puritans, of piratical Vikings, of drunken Noah, and of deluded Adam; but we are equally involved in the sins of the men around us, so far as responsibility, and so far as consequences are considered. If a pointsman on the railway neglects his duties, the unfortunate passengers are involved in his wickedness, to the extent of fright and anger, if not of broken limbs. They will denounce his sin in unstinted phrase, but they cannot repent of his sin. No man repents of any sin but his own, —the wrong things which he has consciously done, said, or thought. Sorrow for other men's sins, sorrow for the sin of the race, is by no means godly sorrow for personal transgression,—the "godly sorrow that worketh repentance." Superfluous as so simple a statement may seem, it is needful to make it, and to emphasize it, since "confession of sin" in the acts of men is so perverted from its proper meaning and force. How many there are who offer to God overmuch confession of a sinful nature as a substitute for personal repentance, and expect that this will bring the fruits of repentance. This is foremost among the pious delusions of Christian souls and the pious frauds of the Christian Church. No man, we may confidently say, ever gained, or ever can gain, God's forgiveness, by telling in confession or by telling in prayer of his evil nature and heart, how wicked the Lord has made him, or by asking the Almighty not to reckon harshly against him the offences of which his fathers were guilty. Most men have enough to be sorry for, enough to repent of, in their own daily offences, and need not add the burden of abstract or hereditary sin to their tale of repentance.

We need to know clearly the sin of which we repent before repentance can begin or can be genuine. A thief repents, not that he is a thief, but that he "stole" something last night or last week from this or that man; not that he is a poor, weak creature, who cannot resist the temptation to ransack the drawers of his fellow-lodgers, but that he has actually opened those drawers, and carried off the clothes and the money. A liar repents, not that his tongue is so troublesome, and betrays him so often, but that he lied yesterday, or last week, or last year, about one or another person. This clear knowledge of the wrong done is essential to genuine penitence for it. So long as one is in doubt whether the thing that he has

Digitized by Google

done is wrong or not, so long his penitence must be in abeyance; it will not begin until he sees distinctly that he has something to repent of. Men say sometimes that they "half-repent" of doing this thing or that; intimating that they are not quite sure whether it was wrong or not,—that they shall be ready to repent of it if it turns out to be wrong in the end. But this half-repentance, this repentance by anticipation, is very ineffective in service, good for nothing in the reformation of habits and character. One cannot prepare repentance before hand, store it up for future use, or make it in any way conditional,—cannot promise to repent in case a doubtful course turns out badly.

And there is one more word to say concerning repentance,—that it is quite another thing from what the larger part of the Christian world have made its substitute and synonym, *penance*. The Scripture has been in many ways grossly perverted in the glosses of the Church, but never more absurdly and monstrously than in rendering the Greek verb *metanoeute*, "do penance." As the Scripture describes it, in the call of John and the call of Jesus, the act is purely spiritual. Good works are the result of penitence, but are not repentance itself. Penance may be the sign of repentance, but is certainly not the thing. A man may do penance most diligently and bravely, may repeat Ave-Marias and Pater-Nosters by the hundred or the thousand, may watch through the long night, may wear the hair-shirts, and scourge the naked flesh, and yet not be penitent at all. Penance is the substitute for penitence, but is by no means the equivalent of penitence; and they wofully err who imagine that the multiplication of pious exercises, the Protestant way of doing penance, is a guarantee of the forgiveness of sins. We do not secure this boon more surely as we put money into the contribution-box, or listen patiently while prayers are repeated, or sit through many long sermons of the painful preachers. That may be genuine penance; but it is not the spiritual change which is available in the order of the divine judgment. The kind of repentance which rescues the soul is best intimated in that stirring call of Micah the Morasthite, "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the High God? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." Do these words teach any doctrine of penance?—*Old and New.*

QUESTIONS ON THE BIBLE.

IT is the custom at colleges to test a student's knowledge on a subject by a series of questions; and we propose by the following questions relating to the Bible to enable our readers to test their own knowledge of the contents of that important book, which is unfortunately much more read than studied. If the reader cannot at once answer, he will do well to open his Bible, and, with the help of a little study, he will soon be able to do so. We trust he will find the employment both interesting and improving. In the next number of the *Missionary* we will give our own answers to these questions,—the reader will then see whether he agrees with us.

1. What was the political aim of King Cyrus, as described in the Book of Isaiah, at the time that he allowed the Jews to return home from captivity? and what after events justified Isaiah's prophecy relating to Cyrus?

2. What Kings of Persia appointed native Jews as viceroys or Governors of Judea? and what were the names of those Jewish governors?

3. On the invasion of Judea by Sennacherib, what advice did Isaiah give as to submission or resistance? and on the invasion by Nebuchadnezzar, what advice was given by Isaiah?

4. On what occasion was Judea governed by a queen? and what was her name?

5. Jesus says, in Matthew v. 20, "If any man sue thee at law, and take away thy undergarment, or shirt, give him thy outer garment, or cloak, also,—Which law in the Pentateuch explains this legal judgment, and thus calls for this remark by Jesus?

6. Apart from the Pentateuch, what is the first mention in Jewish history of the tax on produce called the tythe? and by whom levied?

Digitized by Google

TO OUR READERS.

AFTER considerable experience in Missionary work, we have resolved to attempt the more extensive operation of addressing the readers of a Magazine. The name we have selected for our paper is in itself descriptive. We have not so much in our mind the case of those who enjoy the precious hope and trust which Unitarian Christianity suggests, as of those who have not been placed in favourable circumstances for obtaining a knowledge of that position. We have heard, we may confidently assert, in many parts of the kingdom, the remark that men often had been Unitarians and did not know there were others of the same mind. Our idea, as stated in the prospectus we have sent out, is to have a representation of the theological, religious, and practical doctrines, which, without being fixed into the form of a creed, we know are held more or less in common amongst us. Most Unitarians are agreed that those who are depending upon orthodoxy for a knowledge of Christianity are to be pitied, and if possible they should be helped to know that between orthodoxy and irreligion there is a place to rest.

We invite the attention of our readers to the various papers that have been kindly forwarded to us. From the hearty responses we have received to our Circular, we are encouraged to hope that we shall not incur pecuniary loss. All that is needed is that every one who thinks it desirable to aid us in promoting the knowledge of Unitarian Christianity among the people should take at least two copies, one for himself, the other to give away, which will be sent direct from the Publisher for 2s. 6d. per year, post free.

The *Missionary* is sent forth because we have faith in Unitarianism. We do not profess to be anything but consistent in giving as freely as we have received the good news of a God of infinite absolute goodness. A Father indeed! A brother man in Jesus, whom we regard as an example. But before men reach this position there are many stumbling-blocks to be removed from the way of the seeker after God. We have settled convictions, and we have no reason to doubt but that all Unitarians have settled convictions, at least to this extent, that we consider the idea of God, Jesus, human nature, the nature of true piety, and of the existence beyond the grave, as consistently taught by the orthodox clergy, essentially false. It may be said that, among the intelligent and wealthy of the orthodox churches, there are signs of clear doubt with respect to the fundamental principle of the Church's creed. This may be true. There are, no doubt, hypocrites still in the world. There are still those who make the attempt to serve God and Mammon, who think new wine may be put in old bottles, who fear to leave all and follow Jesus. We judge no man, but to our conscience this conduct is immoral. But, as Christians, we take our stand at Jesus' side. We turn our gaze upon the masses of our nominally Christian land, What idea have they of religion? In nine cases out of ten the poor, ignorant man looks upon a church as a resort for richer men than himself, and that it is not a matter that at all concerns him. As it is said to have been in ancient times, that after the cities and the centres of civilisation had become nominally Christian, the old superstitions and idolatries still lingered in the villages and among the common people,—so is it now.

As Christians we have to face the simple fact that orthodoxy has failed to accomplish the work it had taken in hand. Shall we stand idly by and hesitate to offer our thought of Christ to those who are ignorantly perishing for want of the Bread of Life?

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

WE are proposing to take the studious among our readers through a course of study of the Greek New Testament:—not straight through, but picking here or there as may suit our taste or our Theology. It is not a very difficult study, knowing the English Testament so well as we do, but a very valuable one, and very pleasing.

To be able to read for ourselves the exact words of the earliest writing of the

Digitized by Google

Testament is worth trying for. One quarter of an hour a day, we are told by a busy man, took him all through the Greek Classics in some years. If that same quarter of an hour a day can be given by our diligent reader for some weeks, he will be able to follow in his Greek Testament while his minister reads the lesson in the pulpit

Courage then! Let us begin.

The first thing that will occur to you on starting is, how many words you meet with that are already in our mouths every day. Also, that you have found the origin of numberless allusions, as "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end." The very word Alphabet being A B, Alpha, Beta; as we speak to a little child of his A B C.

GREEK ALPHABET.

Capitals.	Small Capitals.	English.	Names.
Α	α	a	Alpha.
Β	β	b	Bēta.
Γ	γ	g (hard)	Gamma.
Δ	δ	d	Delta.
Ε	ε	e (short)	Epsīlon.
Ζ	ζ	z	Zeta.
Η	η	e (long)	Eta.
Θ	θ	th	Theta.
Ι	ι	i	Iota.
Κ	κ	k	Kappa.
Λ	λ	l	Lambda.
Μ	μ	m	Mu.
Ν	ν	n	Nu.
Ξ	ξ	x	Xi.
Ο	ο	o (short)	Omīcron.
Π	π	p	Pi.
Ρ	ρ	r	Rho.
Σ	σ ς	s	Sigma.
Τ	τ	t	Tau.
Υ	υ	u	Upsīlon.
Φ	φ	ph	Phi.
Χ	χ	ch	Chi.
Ψ	ψ	ps	Psi.
Ω	ω	o (long)	Ōmĕga.

h is not a letter in Greek, but called a rough breathing or aspirate, and is written like a comma reversed. And every word beginning with a vowel has either the aspirate thus ὁς (who), or else the reverse thus ἐξ (out), which is called a soft breathing, and has no sound.*

LESSON THE FIRST.

Let the pupil pronounce the letters exactly like English, and sound every letter except that αι spells i, and ει spells i. Let him spell the lesson through letter by letter, like a little child learning to read for the first time, and helping himself by the alphabet.

Luke xv. 18.

Anastas poreusomai pros ton patera
Αναστας πορευσομαι προς τον πατερα
having risen up I will go unto the Father

μου, και ερω αυτῳ· Πατερ,
of me, and I will say to him; O Father,

ἡμαρτον εις τον ουρανον και ενωπιον
I have sinned unto the heaven and in the sight

σου· ουκετι ειμι αξιος κληθηναι υἱος
of thee; not I am worthy to be called a son

σου· ποιησον με ὡς ἑνα των
of thee; make me as one of the

μισθιων σου. Και αναστας
hired servants of thee. And having risen up

ηλθε προς τον πατερα ἑαυτου.
he came unto the Father of himself.

Ετι δε αυτου μακραν απεχοντος,
Yet and of him afar off being distant,

ειδεν αυτον ὁ πατηρ αυτου, και
saw him the father of him, and

εσπλαγχνισθη· και δραμων επεπεσεν
was moved with pity; and having run fell

επι τον τραχηλον αυτου, και κατεφιλησεν
upon the neck of him, and kissed

αυτον. Ειπε δε αυτῳ ὁ υἱος·
him. Said and to him the son;

Πατερ, ἡμαρτον εις τον ουρανον
Oh, Father, I have sinned unto the heaven

και ενωπιον σου· και ουκετι ειμι
and in the sight of thee; and no longer I am

αξιος κληθηναι υἱος σου. Ειπε δε
worthy to be called a son of thee. Said but

ὁ πατηρ προς τους δουλους αὑτου·
the Father unto the slaves of him;

Ἐξενεγκατε την στολην την πρωτην,
Bring forth the flowing robe the best,

και ενδυσατε αυτον, και δοτε δακτυλιον
and put on him, and put a ring

* To make it simple to the pupil, we leave out all accents and soft breathings, giving only the aspirate and iota subscripta.

Digitized by Google

εις την χειρα αυτου, και ὑποδηματα
upon the hand of him, and shoes

εις τους ποδας· Και ενεγκαντες τον
upon the feet. And having brought the

μοσχον τον σιτευτον θυσατε· και φαγοντες
calf the fatted kill; and eating

ευφρανθωμεν· ὁτι ούτος ὁ υἱος μου
we may be merry because this the son of me

νεκρος ην, και ανεζησε· και απολωλως
dead was, and is alive again; and lost

ην, και εὑρεθη·
was, and has been found.

Next time we will give our student the Greek Article, and show him how to pick out the various cases and genders of the nouns in the text by its help.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

TO the thoughtful mind of one who has obtained for himself the advantage of the Unitarian position, there must at times come a desire that earnest efforts should be made to save the rising generation from the errors which belong to the popular manner of regarding the nature of Christianity.

Connected with almost all Unitarian chapels there are Sunday Schools, but it can hardly be maintained that sufficiently definite results appear, to afford anything like satisfaction.

We have known children pass several years in a Sunday School and never afterwards be seen at the services of the chapel. It is worthy of serious consideration, How is it that young people, belonging usually to families who have no knowledge of Unitarian Christianity, or connection with it, should become acquainted with teachers and friends in the school, and yet should perhaps, in nine cases out of ten, fail to take the further step into the congregation? Some time since we had a conversation with a young woman whom we had known as a scholar for years, but who had left her old friends, and was attending an orthodox chapel. Now, the reasons given by that young woman for this step were to us unsatisfactory. She loved her old teachers and friends. She did not believe they were not Christians. She knew nothing about orthodoxy; and when pressed if she really believed the doctrine of Eternal Torments as held by the church she was attending, she asserted she did not. What then was her chief reason? It was the companionship of other young women, and a Bible class, connected with the earnest desire shown by some one to make her think seriously and deeply upon the religious life.

One speaker remarked, at the meeting of the Sunday School Association last Whitsuntide, that the failure of our efforts to introduce new blood into our church life through our schools was owing to our lack of religion. This was met by the statement of another speaker, who thought there was more religion in Unitarians than came into sight. If the latter be true, and we are inclined to believe it is, it may be asked of teachers and others who are friends to the Sunday School movement, Why do you not make the children know and feel that you are deeply concerned for their moral and religious welfare? But this is a great subject. We simply introduce it to our readers. The *Unitarian Missionary* would not be true to its work if it did not watch closely the progress of the only means exercised in many of our churches to influence for good the masses who are living and dying without a knowledge of the truth which Unitarian Christians are privileged to enjoy.

MISSIONARY WORK.

From our Own Correspondents.

MANCHESTER.

I THINK it would not be uninteresting to many of your readers, in various parts of the kingdom, if from time to time you were to publish letters from the chief centres of Liberal Christianity, detailing, as far as possible, the different organizations and plans of operation in existence, and noting whatever of success or of general interest is likely to cheer and strengthen those who are quietly labouring in more lonely spheres of usefulness. I do not think it will be out of place if the first such letter comes from Manchester. Only last week I was speaking to a student in Lancashire Independent College about a meeting of Nonconforming ministers recently held, at which some six or eight Unitarian Ministers from Manchester were present. He expressed surprise, and said he

Digitized by Google

thought we were far less numerous, and he only knew of one Unitarian Chapel—that in Cross Street. I then gave him part of the information I repeat here. Besides the Cross Street Chapel, with its two respected ministers, we have a large and flourishing congregation at the Strangeways Unitarian Free Church; and a fine building, rather badly attended, and at present without any settled minister, in Upper Brook Street. In addition to these three places in Manchester proper, there are a number of other congregations, with and without settled ministers, within a radius of some three or four miles from the Exchange. At all these churches steady progress is being made. This very day a handsome church, one of, if not *the* most handsome in the denomination, is to be opened at Gorton, where the Rev. G. H. Wells, M.A., has laboured for many years. Other churches, with settled ministers, are—those at Rusholme, Monton, Blackley, Failsworth, and Swinton, and the two Domestic Missions,—one in Rochdale Road, and the other in Hulme. By means of the Manchester District Unitarian Association, several other places are kept going, the services being conducted by neighbouring ministers and laymen, assisted by the Home Missionary Board. The Secretary of the District Association is the Rev. Brooke Herford, under whose guidance there is no doubt about true success. The congregations it assists are — Ardwick, Miles Platting, Pendleton, Swinton, and Middleton. The two last mentioned places already have ministers of their own. At Pendleton a new church, to cost £2500, is to be erected. I believe the plans have already been chosen, and that an appeal is being made for assistance in money. At Middleton the Rev. B. Glover is working hard, but under many disadvantages. I hear that the congregation there are about to purchase and fit up the room in which they meet. This is undoubtedly one of the first things they ought to do, for the hall is far from being comfortable and attractive. At Miles Platting there is a great field for effort,—the friends there are about to choose a minister, help having been promised them from the Association for this purpose; there is no doubt that if the people are united, and thoroughly attached to an earnest and thoughtful minister, Miles Platting will one day have a large working-class congregation. At Ardwick we have one of the most energetic band of workers to be met with anywhere. It is fortunate in possessing active and zealous laymen, who are ever ready to conduct their own services, or to assist their neighbours. I cannot speak at any length about the places I have mentioned. There are rumours that more than one other new chapel is talked about. At Failsworth about £350 has already been promised, and an appeal to the public is spoken of. But Pendleton has got into the field first, and will probably occupy most attention for some time to come. A new chapel is certainly needed at Failsworth as much as anywhere— for the old building is almost falling in pieces, and is frequently too small. Enough has been said to show that we are far from dying out yet, at all events in Manchester; if any one doubts what I say, let him come to the meetings of the Home Missionary Board and Missionary Conference, which will be held next month, and he will soon be undeceived.—*M.*—*Dec.* 20.

LONDON.

The great metropolis, with its teeming population of all classes and ranks and nations, equal in number to that of many a kingdom, is by no means the place where missionary effort makes the most marked effect. The hurry of business, the whirl of pleasure, into the vortices of which nearly every one is drawn, are not favourable to calm devotional thought; distances and cosmopolitan feeling stand in the way of either united or local action. But we are happy to say that even there considerable activity has been shown during the autumn. The London District Unitarian Society have laboured to spread a knowledge of the simple views of Unitarian Christianity in different localities, and to stimulate the people to think for themselves, rather than to be content with the additions and superstitions with which priests and churches have mystified Christianity. For the eastern district of Mile End a course of lectures was given in their station by London ministers. These were principally attended by the working classes. The room was sometimes crowded—interest, and often sympathy, were expressed by the audiences. Another set of lectures were given in the more middle-class district of Dalston, in a public hall Some friends of the popular theology had taken care to hire the hall and give them a preliminary warning against Unitarianism; this however, did not prevent a fair attendance of those not used to their opinions. To elucidate the soundness and rationality of the position of the pure Christian, it was determined to meet the Secularists on their own ground—and the Hall of Science was hired and some of the most able and eloquent of our ministers responded to a request that they would state Unitarianism there; large audiences—on one occasion about 500—listened, and expressed their sympathy with the views of the speakers—Mr A. Holyoake presided on some occasions, and eulogised the fair spirit in which the subjects were set forth—on all occasions questions were permited at the close of the addresses, and were answered by the lecturers. Lists of the Unitarian Chapels in the metropolis and of books and publications, as well as doctrinal tracts, were distributed at the doors. Useful and stimulating as these course of lectures have been, more remarkable and interesting have the eight conferences been, conducted in the Stamford Street Chapel, Southwark, by the Rev. R. Spears. He being Chairman, opened by an address of about twenty minutes, and then the meeting was open for any one to speak for not more than ten minutes, but strictly confining himself to the subject in hand. Several meetings were attended by about 80 people; and as many as 17 have expressed their opinions in one evening. On some occasions all the speakers were from other churches; but so divergent were their views that, even had the opener desired, there seemed no need to make any reply. On the last evening the subject taken was—"Is Christ God?" and on this occasion it was arranged that speakers of opposite views should alternate. The temperate and thoughtful way in which, on this, as on all occasions, the speakers expressed themselves was very remarkable, and showed a fairness that must be conducive to truth, and could not fail of having an instructive effect on the audiences. Both the speakers and the audience expressed their satisfaction that fair and useful opportunities had

Digitized by Google

been given for considering subjects from all sides, —and we learn that one of the orthodox churches has commenced a *course of conferences;* but it is there understood that speakers are to be assenters to the proposition set before them. There is good evidence that the work of these lectures and conferences has not been bestowed in vain,—and we are glad to hear that the Committee are arranging to re-commence operations in the latter part of next month.

IRELAND.

When it is borne in mind that there are some forty congregations in Ireland whose members hold Unitarian views, it seems somewhat strange and unaccountable that there should be little, if any, distinctively missionary work carried on. It appears there is only one missionary in connection with our body in the whole kingdom, and he is in the service of the Belfast Domestic Mission. The spirit which, within the last ten years, has awakened new life in many of our congregations in England has not been felt to any appreciable extent in Ireland. Owing to various causes, it has been found impossible in some cases to maintain existing congregations in a vigorous condition, and the desire to propagate our views has not of late years manifested itself in any very marked manner. The withdrawal of the State grant, upon which both minister and people were too long taught to rely, will make it difficult if not impossible for the smaller and weaker congregations to obtain the services of settled ministers in the future. The work for our body in Ireland seems to be to keep an open door for our free theology, wherever one has been opened, by missionary agency. The majority of our congregations belong to the rural districts and villages; and these do not afford a promising field for missionary operations. Cottage and barn services have, indeed, been conducted in some districts with good results, but this has always been done in connection with settled congregations. In the growing and prosperous towns missionary work ought to be carried on. Belfast has now a population of 120,000. There are three Unitarian congregations in it, and a Domestic Mission. The latter is well managed, and very useful. There is ample room for another mission;—why, indeed, should there not be a mission-station in every town? The Belfast Unitarian Depository is one of the most flourishing of our institutions. For a long time it was kept in a back street,—like too many of our Unitarian chapels—but it is now located in one of the leading thoroughfares, and a glance at its windows does one's heart good, while inside there is an admirable stock of books, tracts, &c., and the business done is very satisfactory. The Depository is a missionary agency in itself. The Belfast Unitarian Society has been making efforts to revive the cause at Ballymena, which is a growing and prosperous town. Evening service has been conducted for some months by the neighbouring minister. An appeal has been made by the Society for funds to carry on missionary operations in Ulster. There is great need of a revival, in the true sense, in the Unitarian Church generally; and in Ireland it could not come too soon. If we in our humble way can do anything to help on the good cause there, we shall gladly do so.

A HINT FOR FELLOWSHIP FUNDS.

The Liverpool Unitarian Fellowship Fund Society was founded in the year 1818 by the Rev. John Yates and others. It owed its existence in great measure to the energy of its first Secretary, the Rev. George Harris, then Minister of Renshaw Street Chapel, and afterwards well known throughout Scotland for his untiring zeal in missionary enterprize. In common with many similar associations, which were set on foot about the beginning of the century, this Society was originally established with a view to afford occasional contributions to Congregations which stand in need of assistance for building and repairing Chapels; to administer relief to infirm ministers; to aid in the education of young men for the ministry; and generally to promote the cause of Unitarian Christianity. Its operations have not been restricted by any local limit, for while it has been largely instrumental during the last few years in reviving the Unitarian interest at Prescot, it has, within the same period, made grants to Aberdeen and Dundee in the north; to Poole and Stratford (Essex) in the south; as also to Accrington, Barnard Castle, Cirencester, Longton, Padiham, and many other places. The Annual Meeting was held on the 18th inst., under the presidency of W. J. Lamport, Esq., and was influentially attended. The President explained why it was thought desirable to begin the New Year by extending the functions of the Society, and enlarging its committee. The meeting unanimously adopted the following resolution, on the motion of the Rev. Charles Beard, seconded by the Rev. C. Wicksteed:—"That, in order to secure a renewed and increased interest in the Liverpool Unitarian Fellowship Fund Society, that this meeting instruct the committee to take cognizance as far as possible of the various claims on the beneficence of our Liverpool friends which are urged from time to time on behalf of Congregations, Chapels, Missionary exertions, &c., with a view to placing these claims before the members of our Congregations, with the sanction of a careful sifting and recommendation."

It would be a great saving of trouble and annoyance, both to those who make such apppli-cations as are here contemplated, and to those who continually receive them, if some such Committee of inquiry and recommendation were organised in each of our large towns. The Fellowship Fund Committee, where it exists, might well assume this place, and act as a board of prudent and careful examiners into the merits of each case as it arises, to invite our denominational benevolence. The result would certainly not be to check the flow of individual gifts, but rather to stimulate a wider and more willing response to the appeal when stamped with the Committee's approval, and encouraged by such grants as the funds at its disposal may allow it to make. The Liverpool Committee, which consists of eighteen gentlemen, will henceforth meet quarterly for this purpose on Sundays, after morning service; and all who have appeals to make to the generosity of Liverpool Unitarians, and who wish to present their applications in the way most likely to ensure success, should, before undertaking any private canvas, send in a statement of their case to the Secretary of the Liverpool Unitarian Fellowship Fund Society, the Rev. Alexander Gordon.

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

No. 2. FEBRUARY 1872. PRICE 1D.

ORTHODOX DOCTRINES DENIED BY UNITARIANS.

No. 1.—THE WORD INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

ALL Christians value the Bible. All Protestants especially profess to make it the foundation of their religious faith and practice. It is therefore a very important question: what is the right method of using the Bible? Shall we regard all parts of it as of equal value and authority? Orthodoxy teaches that the Bible *is* the word of God, and that the whole of it has been written by the direct Inspiration of God, so that its very language, as well as its general meaning, is in every repect infallibly true. A few quotations from orthodox writers will show that this is their opinion.

"The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the throne. Every book of it—every chapter of it—every verse of it—every word of it—every syllable of it—(where are we to stop?)—every letter of it—is the direct utterance of the most High. The Bible is none other than the Word of God—not some part of it more, some part of it less, but all alike the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the throne—absolute, faultless, unerring, supreme."—*Burgon, Inspiration and Interpretation, p.* 89.

"The Bible cannot be less than verbally inspired. Every word, every syllable, every letter is just what it would be had God spoken from heaven, without any human intervention." —*Dr Baylee, Verbal Inspiration, p.* 48.

This doctrine is denied by Unitarians for the following reasons:

I.—The Bible consists of different books, written by different authors and at different periods. As to some of these books, no one professes, at the present day, to know who wrote them. As to others, there is a great difference of opinion in regard to their authors. Some are histories, some prophecies, some psalms or hymns, some treatises on philosophical subjects, some letters to communities or individuals. One part was written at least 1000 years before another part. We need, therefore, some very strong proof to convince us that these writings, so various in subject, in time, and in authorship, were written with a peculiar help from God to prevent the possibility of mistake in word or letter. It is well known that there were many questions raised, before the Bible came into its present form, as to what books should be included in it. By what means did those who determined these questions ascertain that the particular books they admitted, and none other, were verbally inspired? What evidence have we that *they* were infallible in their decision? Luther considered that they were not, and that they had made some mistakes.

But even if the books of the Bible were, in the first instance, every word true, this is of no use to *us*, unless we have them now in a similarly perfect state. For many centuries they existed only in writing, and were copied by hand; each new copy that was made was liable to mistakes

Digitized by Google

on the part of the copyist. In every existing manuscript there are differences of words from other manuscripts. Thousands of such differences have been detected, and no one can now say with certainty what was the original. The verbal infallibility then, if it ever existed, is now for ever lost. Again, the unlearned reader has to depend on the English translation, which was made by men who were liable to error; and there are differences of opinion among scholars as to the right translation of many passages. No one will contend, that not only the first writers, but also all the copyists, translators and printers employed on the Bible have been so guided by God, as to prevent the possibility of verbal mistakes. The verbal accuracy is therefore completely out of the question in the English Bible of the present day; and it is not reasonable to suppose that God would work a stupendous miracle to give this word-inspiration, when the advantage of it would be so soon lost to the world, as time went on.

II.—If the entire Bible is the inspired word of God, all parts of it must agree—must agree, not in general meaning only, but in detail, in words. Yet there are many minor contradictions. An instance or two of these will suffice. *Gen. vi.* 19, says *two* of each kind of animals were to be taken into the ark; *Gen. vii.* 2, says *seven.* Both cannot be true. In *II Sam. xxiv.* 1, we are told *God* moved David to number the people, but in *I Chron. xxi.* 1, we are told it was *Satan.* Which are we to believe? Each of the four gospels gives in different words the title set up over the cross of Christ. Only one can be correct. Such differences in detail might easily arise in the case of independent narrators, and do not affect the general correctness of the narrative, but they are inconsistent with the notion that *every word* is written by God, who cannot err in small things any more than in great ones. But there are also inconsistencies in the spirit and substance of different parts of the Bible. Compare the Mosaic law, *Lev. xxiv.* 20, and the maledictions of *Psalms lviii.*, *lix.*, *lxix.*, *&c.*, with the teachings of Christ, *Matt. v.* 44. Do both alike come from God? If so, He is not unchangeable and without shadow of turning. Paul and James, in their epistles, teach different doctrines as to the relative value of faith and works; are all the epistles then the infallible word of God?

Besides, there are in the Bible many evident mistakes and exaggerations as to numbers; there are errors in matter of science and natural history; there are expressions altogether at variance with modern discoveries. These facts do not render the Bible the less useful for religious purposes, but they prove that its *words* are not inspired by God who knows all things.

III.—Verbal inspiration is unnecessary. What men need from God is truth, spiritual influence, religion; when these are granted, human powers can find words in which to communicate them to others. Honest witnesses can record events they have seen, apostles can write letters to their converts, the pious can compose psalms, and the wise can address exhortations, without any supernatural guidance. In a narrative like that in the book of Esther (in which the name of God does not once occur) or in Paul's directions about having his books and cloak sent after him, why should divine inspiration be needed? The only purpose for which it could be given must be to afford an infallible guide to religious truth, and in these there is no reference to religion. Neither does it serve this purpose, for those men who have accepted the Bible as infallible have not, as a consequence, agreed in their doctrines. The different sects, in the present day, all find proofs of their different creeds in the Bible. Whatever inspiration there were in the words, this would not produce uniformity of belief, unless all men understood them in the same way. We must have an infallible interpreter, as well as an infallible Bible, or this latter will not prevent doubts and difficulties and divisions among mankind. Has God then granted verbal inspiration to the writers of the Scriptures when no permanent good can be effected, when all the benefit men gain from the Bible can be as well obtained without such inspiration?

IV.—If a writer was conscious that he had this Divine help—that his words were not his own but God's—he would surely state it at the outset, in order to obtain the attention and secure the submission of his readers. Where do any of the writers in the Bible do this? Where does any one say in plain words that God taught him what words to use? On the contrary, some of the writers profess to use their own

Digitized by Google

powers, and refer to the ordinary human means they employed. See *Luke i.* 1-4; *I John v.* 1 & 3; *II Cor. xi.* 23. There is one text quoted on the other side, *II Tim. iii.* 16, but this does not affirm word-inspiration. The literal translation is, "All Scripture God-breathed and profitable for doctrine, &c." The word *is* does not appear in the Greek, but is inserted by the translator, and the text may be understood, "All inspired scripture is also profitable for doctrine, &c." The word "God-breathed" (given by inspiration) does not say that the inspiration is of a character to make the scripture in every word infallible. The scripture referred to is that of the Old Testament, mentioned in the preceding verse. The New Testament was only being written when these words were used. The text, therefore, teaches nothing of the Bible as a whole. It cannot out-weigh the effect of the marks found in so many other places, that the writers depended on their own human powers to decide what words they should use.

Since, then, this doctrine of Orthodoxy is (1) inconsistent with the history of the Bible, (2) opposed by the self-contradictions of Scripture, (3) not necessary and practically useless, (4) not claimed by the writers themselves; Unitarians reject it. Any one of these objections would be by itself sufficient; taken together, they form a firm ground of conviction that the doctrine is untrue.

We reject the doctrine, not because we do not value the Bible, but because we do value it so highly that we wish to see it free from a doctrine which causes it to clash with reason and science and common sense. If every word of it comes from God, how can you explain its self-contradictions, its opposition to the teachings of Geology, Astronomy, &c., its cases of doubtful morality? But if the Bible is regarded as the work of men,—*containing* in many parts the word of God, but not *being* as a whole the word of God,—with a divine side, but also with a human side, —we are left at liberty to use it as the great storehouse of religious truth and spiritual influence; we can view it as teaching religion only, and therefore liable on other subjects to the mistakes common in the time of its writers; we can discriminate between the importance, value, and authority of the several books. In such a belief, Unitarians bow to the spirit of the Bible and not to its letter. "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." *II Cor. iii.* 6.

JOHN WRIGHT.

AN ORTHODOX CONCESSION.

WE would draw attention to a critical admission of no slight importance made by a minister of the most orthodox among the Presbyterian bodies. It is one that affects the scriptural foundation of the commonly received doctrine of a hell hereafter. The Rev. James S. Candlish, A.M., of the East Free Church, Aberdeen, in a sermon delivered after the death of a member of his congregation, and published, by request, under the title of "The Keys of Death and Hades in Jesus' Hand," has two passages, in which he offers a rendering of the Greek word Hades different from that found in the Authorised Version, and generally accepted by the orthodox. Speaking of the death of Jesus, he says:—"Thus he became altogether as one of us in his earthly life, and entered into the state of the dead. His body lay cold and lifeless in the tomb, and His soul was, for a season, in what is here (*i.e.*, in Rev. i. 18) called hell—that is, not the place of torment, but Hades, the invisible world, the abode of departed spirits." Again he says:—"Death is the passage of the soul out of this world; hell means the invisible world, the place into which death admits the soul, while the body lies in the grave and returns to dust. Death, then, is the portal; Hades, or the unseen world, the region into which it opens; the gates of death and the gates of Hades are figurative phrases that occur in Scripture for the passage to or from the abode of departed spirits." This concession is of importance. Not that it has not been made before; for several able orthodox divines have shown that the correct meaning of Hades is the one given by Mr Candlish. But it is one of many indications that a better time is dawning—that facts of Biblical criticism, which Unitarians

Digitized by Google

have been subjected to obloquy for declaring, are beginning to be made known from orthodox pulpits. And for a single indication of that kind we should be thankful. Besides, the admission makes a sweep among the "proof-texts" brought forward in support of the doctrine of an endless hell. Hades occurs eleven times in the New Testament, and is ten times rendered hell. Gehenna occurs only twelve times; so that, with the corrected rendering of Hades, only half of the "proof-texts" are left, and they, if treated in the same frank, critical manner, would be seen to afford still less proof than the others. And one of the passages of Scripture where Hades occurs (Luke xvi. 23) is actually found among the "proof-texts" to chapter xxxii. of the Westminster Confession, in support of the affirmation that "the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day." And thus Mr Candlish is really dealing a blow at his Church's darling Confession. And may he not stop before he has done still further service in the same direction! He has done well in giving a public declaration of the true meaning of Hades; and we trust he may be led to deal equal justice to other words and passages in the Authorised Version—a duty orthodox teachers pay only too indifferent attention to.

J. G. S.

A LAYMAN'S MINISTRY AT BARNARD CASTLE.

EIGHT and twenty years ago, in the town of Barnard Castle, in Durham, George Brown left the ranks of the Wesleyans, among whom he had been brought up, and quietly but determinedly took his place among the slender band of Unitarians who were worshipping in obscurity not far from his home. Mr Brown was at that time a young man in the prime of life, rapidly rising, by his own unassisted exertions, to a high position in the law. He was already of some note in his town, and was busied in every movement that was made for improvement and education, originating its newspaper, founding its Mechanics' Institute, and labouring indefatigibly among his townsmen in all works of public spirit. It was at this time that Methodism was very considerably shaken in the northern counties by the spread of a spirit of religious inquiry. Several of its larger congregations received a split; and at Barnard Castle a few men of very humble rank bravely declared their change of opinions by meeting for Unitarian worship at the house of one of themselves, where each Sunday they read the Scriptures together, and joined in prayer. Into this little meeting-room, after some hesitation, George Brown made his way. But the important step once taken, he deliberated no longer. With his natural energy and heartiness, he did not stand looking out for the social persecution he had called upon himself, but set himself to preach and to lecture among his new friends, both in-doors and in the open air, and did all that could be done in this way to lessen the loneliness of his new position. Nay, further, he went forward to meet the gathering storm, he established a printing office, and, under the signature of "A Layman," he sent forth from his press pamphlet after pamphlet exposing the errors of the popular theology, and labouring to spread what he believed to be the truth. It scarcely need be said that such a man presently lived down all persecution and reproach. Heretic or no heretic, to use the words of his biographer, Barnard Castle could not do without him; and when he died lately, at the age of fifty-eight, his twenty-four years of lay-ministry had done a great work, and spread a leaven of courageous excellence far wider abroad than the circle of the little congregation.

If one wishes to unlearn selfishness, let him go apart, and stand alone by himself.

However logical our induction, the end of the thread is fastened upon the assurance of faith.

God's work is carried on by oscillations—now the truth swings to this extreme, now to that; and between he weaves his steady and perfect plan.

Must a man get a correct philosophy of prayer before he prays? Must a child, ready to run into its father's arms, stop and study mental processes before it yields to the impulses of its love?

Digitized by Google

WORKS.

THE essence of Faith is an inclination of the soul toward God. Growing, as do all man's active faculties, in virtue of nutriment and exercise, it becomes a spiritual power, and a spiritual sense, which makes the invisible visible, the absent present, revealing God to the soul, and so inspiring the human with divine and everlasting forces. Thus viewed, Faith corresponds to what in morals is called moral principle. It is indeed the inner and the higher man. As an inward impulse it has a formative and refining efficacy, whence comes man's highest and fullest development, and, as a consequence, his supreme good. A suckling sundered from its nurse pines and dies. So a man without faith is a man without manliness. A true manly life, then, can ensue from nothing short of a pure and vital faith. The term "Works," given as the title of this paper, denotes that man's condition. It is the outward without the inward. It is a tree without sap. It is an apple without its juices. Consequently it is a form without the underlying substance:—perhaps a shrivelled form, perhaps an unquickened germ, certainly an organism arrested in its development. As either of these, it is something that has not fulfilled its destiny, and, in consequence, a failure.

Similar failures are numerous in the social world. Here is the man of intellect, who limits himself to believing what he sees, that is, with his bodily eyes, and so makes himself totally incapable of religion. Could he succeed in the restriction, he would ever act for the morrow, nor rise above the sod. Here is another man, all of whose higher faculties have been left undisciplined and unquickened. Scarcely does he stand on a higher level than the horse which he drives, or the cow which he milks. Nay, rather, he sinks below their level, for they cannot sin, and he cannot be virtuous with the virtue of a human being,—well if he does not become as foul and wicked as he is doltish and sensual. Whatever misses the end for which it was created inevitably becomes corrupt. The greatest failure is gross sin; hence its deadliness.

And so we are brought to see what "Works" are. Understand the term, and you will at once learn that they are, at the best, worthless. Translate the word. Instead of Works say Deeds, say Acts:—are deeds in themselves virtuous, or acts? Then is the idiot virtuous, and the maniac righteous. But your deed may be of service to me,—is it not, then, a good or virtuous deed? No! not relatively to me. Nothing is good that is not meant for good. The aim and motive determine the character of the act. If I intend to do you good from a wish for your good, I am myself good so far as the act goes, and not less should I remain good should the act prove injurious to you rather than beneficial.

Works, then, in themselves, have no moral quality. But a moral quality may be given to Works. Works relied on as if in themselves good become positively bad, inasmuch as they supersede that internal moral element whence all goodness springs. This subterfuge is very common and very baneful. It substitutes form and ritual for the religion of the heart and life. It makes church-going a virtue, and puts long prayers and disfigured faces in the place of active beneficence and self-control. It is the prolific parent of shams and shows. If not hypocrisy itself, it is its next door neighbour. Among these shams and shows is the very common error of vicarious religion. Imputed righteousness is as little a reality as imputed knowledge or imputed wealth. If every moral quality depends on my motive, and my aim, then, is religion (like virtue)—then is holiness an individual matter. As little as I become happy by having your happiness written down to my credit, so little can you become pure by the transference to you of my sanctity. As well call light darkness, or darkness light, as suppose you can make evil good or good evil by the charm of sacredotal imputation.

This substitutional show is a relic of Romanism. That mother of falsities taught (and teaches) that Christ as God obtained by his death merit enough to atone for the sins of the world. Not satisfied with this infinite "enough," the Papal Church declares that every saint makes, in his own merits, an addition to

Digitized by Google

that which, as infinite, could not be augmented. The sum total is (so to say) treasured up in the Papal sanctuary, to be distributed at the Papal pleasure. As a means of enriching popes, cardinals, and priests, this resource was very efficacious. To the Protestant Reformers, however, the whole seemed a delusion and a snare. Renouncing the system, they yet retained the notion of merit:—that is, that my works may be made yours. The true, the only source of merit available with God are the atoning and vicarious sufferings of Jesus. Believe in Christ and you become holy as Christ is holy; and by believing in Christ is meant that you hold that his merits are transferred to you.

This is the simple religion of the Sermon on the Mount transmuted into a system of legerdemain, by which God's everlasting realities are changed into their opposites—white becoming black, and black white, and the most wicked of men are rewarded as if they were the most virtuous. This is to undermine the pillars of the moral universe.

What a curse to the race have dogmatical forms of religion been!—and yet Scotland still hugs "The Assembly's Catechism."

J. R. BEARD.

JOHN I. 1—4.

PERHAPS, in proportion to its size, no part of a sentence is so important as a stop. If a stop is misplaced, the meaning of a sentence may be wholly changed; and yet, strange to say, many, and perhaps most of the ancient manuscripts of the Greek Testament, are without stops. The reader, therefore, or the editor for him, has to use his own judgment where to divide the sentences. We will give a rather important instance of this at the beginning of John's Gospel, where, in verses 3 and 4 of chap. i., we read, if we place the stops as they are in the Authorised Version,

"All things were made through it (the Word), and without it was not anything made that was made. In it was life, and the life was the light of men."

But by a better way of dividing the sentences—a way that had the approval of Origen and many of our best modern critics—and by a slight improvement in translation, the above words will stand as follows:—

"All things were made through it (the Word), and without it was not anything made whatever. What was made by means of it was life, and the life was the light of men."

Now, either of these sentences places Life in strong contrast with Light. The New Life of Christianity is Light to man; and the second of our two sentences helps us to understand that the writer is describing a second creation, and is contrasting the creation of Light, as described in the first chapter of Genesis, with the creation of the New Life which he is himself going to describe. Both are made by God's Word or Command. As in the Book of Genesis, God said, Let there be light; so now, speaking through the mouth of Jesus, he says, Let there be spiritual life.

If we turn back to verses 1 and 2, we shall see that we were twice told that in the beginning the Word was with God. Now, the writer certainly did not mean to tell us the same thing twice over. By one beginning he meant the origin of Christianity; and by the other beginning he meant the origin of the world. Thus he makes a comparison between the two acts of creation which were both made by the Word of God; and the whole may be paraphrased in the following manner—

"In the beginning [of Christianity] was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was with God in the [former] beginning [as described in Genesis i.] All things were made through it, and without it was not anything made whatever. [As at first light was made by means of it, so now] what was made by means of it was life, and the life was the light of men."

In neither case was the Word the Creator, but the instrument of creation. Again and again in the New Testament, though it does not appear in the Authorised Version, God is said to have spoken through the old prophets; so, now, the writer of the Fourth Gospel means to tell us that God spake through Jesus, saying, with rather a violent figure of speech, in verse 14, that the Word became flesh. But all this, though expressed in rather philosophical language, gives no foundation whatever to the opinion that Jesus was himself God, or that he had existed before he was born the son of Joseph and Mary.

Digitized by Google

THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

THESE two Epistles were both written at the same time, and probably sent by the same messenger. In both, the writer says that he has many things to write which he will not trust to paper—probably thinking it more courteous and friendly to express his displeasure by word of mouth. In the third Epistle, which is addressed to his friend Gaius, he says, "I have written to the Church," thus pointing to the second Epistle, and explaining the words, "The elect lady and her children," to whom the second Epistle is addressed, to mean a congregation. It was not uncommon with the Hebrew writers to speak of a number of persons by means of a feminine noun, as in the Prophets, the people of Jerusalem are called the "Daughter of Jerusalem." In Psalm xlv., the Tyrians are called "the Daughter of Tyre;" in Psalm lxviii., the people who did not go to battle are called "she that tarried at home." Thus, the greeting at the end of the second Epistle, "The children of thy elect sister greet thee," simply means that one congregation greets the other. In the third Epistle we see that the writer was very much displeased with Diotrephes, a member of the congregation, whom he means to blame severely when he visits them; and this displeasure with part of the congregation is clearly expressed in the second Epistle, though in rather a guarded manner, when he says, "I rejoiced greatly that I found *some* of thy children walking in truth."

The writer, John the Elder, must be distinguished from John the Apostle. He probably lived about half a generation later than the Apostles.

It does not clearly appear what doctrine or difference of opinion made the division in the Church which is spoken of in the third Epistle; but it probably was that the Judaizing party wished to exclude from the congregation those of the Pagan converts who would not submit to the bondage of the Jewish Law, while the other party with more liberal views wished to admit them. The writer, John the Elder, with his friends Gaius and Demetrius, belonged to the liberal party; while Diotrephes was for excluding such converts, and for casting out of the Church those who would admit them. The only opinion distinctly blamed is that of those who denied that the Christ had as yet made his appearance in the flesh. Thus, Christianity would seem by this time to have gained a considerable footing, since there was already a body of men who could take the trouble to preach and talk against it, and to say that Jesus was not the Christ.

THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON.

THIS title is conferred on Jesus Christ exactly five times in the whole of the New Testament—viz., in the Gospel of John i. 14—"And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the *only begotten* of the Father, full of grace and truth;" same chapter, at the 18th verse—"No man hath seen God at any time; the *only-begotten Son*, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." Same Gospel, chap. iii. verse 16—"God so loved the world, that He gave His *only begotten Son*, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life;" and verse 18—"He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the *only begotten Son* of God." The last time it occurs is in the first Epistle of John, iv. 9—"In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His *only begotten Son* into the world, that we might live through him."

From these quotations the curious fact is at once evolved—that John is the only New Testament writer who applies this title to his Master; and that it is never so applied by Matthew, or Mark, or Luke, in their Gospels; or by Paul, or Peter, or James, or Apollos, in their speeches in Acts, or in any of their Epistles. The obvious inference from this fact is, that the title cannot refer to anything peculiar and exceptional in Christ's nature, or in the mode of his

Digitized by Google

generation, the reception of which is essential to our salvation, or the leading Apostles and Evangelists would not have failed, not merely to mention it, but to dwell upon it with frequency and earnestness.

That the term, "only begotten," had not in itself any mysterious signification is plain from this reflection, that it is used in speaking of at least four other persons in the New Testament, though that fact does not always appear in our Translation. Three of these instances are the following:—In Luke vii. 12, where the son of the Widow of Nain is called her "only son," the Greek is, "*only begotten* son;" in Luke viii. 42, where the daughter of Jairus is called his "only daughter," the Greek is, "*only begotten* daughter;" in Luke ix. 38, where one of the populace beseeches Christ to heal his son, and urges the plea, "for he is mine only child," the Greek is, "mine *only begotten* child." From these citations it appears, with striking plainness and emphasis, that "only begotten" means no more than "only;" and, therefore, that when our Master is characterised as the "only begotten Son of God," no more is intended to be conveyed than that he was the *only* Son of God.

At this stage of our investigation the question presents itself—How is Jesus the *only* Son of God, when there are multitudes of *other* Sons of God also mentioned in the New Testament? This fact, for fact it is, is to a great degree hidden from the unlearned reader in our Authorised Version;—let it be our business to remove the veil which conceals it. Matt. v. 9—"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children (Gr., sons) of God." Matt. v. 45—"That ye may be the children (Gr., sons) of your Father which is in heaven." Luke vi. 35—"But love your enemies, and do good . . . and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children (Gr., sons) of the Highest." Luke xx. 36—"Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children (Gr., sons) of God." Rom. viii. 14—"For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the *Sons* of God." Rom. ix. 26—"And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children (Gr., sons) of the living God." Gal. iii. 26—"For ye are all the children (Gr., sons) of God by faith in Christ Jesus."

The question now returns—If all these hosts of the pure, the upright, the holy, were also, as they unquestionably were, in the Scriptural acceptation of that term, "Sons of God," how was Christ the *only* Son? The answer readily suggests itself, that "only Son" signifies *dear as an only Son;* in other words, that it is equivalent to *best-beloved* Son. This conclusion, which I have had in view all along, is confirmed, nay, is independently established, by the remarkable fact, that the favourite child was called the "only" Son, nay, even the "only begotten" Son, *when there were other Sons in the same family!* Thus we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews, xi. 17—"By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac; and he that had received the promises offered up his *only begotten Son.*" As Abraham had another son, Ishmael, by Hagar; and six other sons by Keturah; Isaac must be called his "only begotten" (that is, "only") son, simply in the sense that he was his *best-beloved* son. Confirmatory of this is a remarkable passage in Josephus (Antiquities, book xx. ch. ii.) where he says of the king of Adiabene, "He had, indeed, Monobazus, his elder brother, by Helena also; as he had other sons by other wives besides; yet did he openly place all his affections on this, his *only begotten* son, Izates." Nothing could more completely strengthen our conclusion that "only begotten" signifies neither more nor less than *best-beloved;* so that, while God had, and ever has, hosts of other "Sons," all the pure, all the pious, all the benevolent; yet is Jesus His only begotten, His only, His best-beloved Son, because in these high qualities he greatly transcended his brethren, and made unspeakably nearer approaches to the moral and spiritual excellencies of the Infinitely Perfect.

R. E. B. MACLELLAN.

Peace is an attribute of the highest power. Silence reigns throughout those enormous spaces where worlds travel on their way. Silence wraps that electric life which animates nature, and which is thus more powerful than when it is disclosed in thunder. A sea of silence lies around the throne of God, and the Almighty speaks not, and utters no sound. So in this peace of a religious soul, there is evidence of a hidden power that is greater than any outward force.

Digitized by Google

CHRISTIANITY IN COMMON LIFE.

ON Sunday evening last, the Rev. C. Beard, minister of Renshaw Street Chapel, Liverpool, delivered, in the Concert Hall, Lord Nelson Street, an address on "Good Government," being the first of a course of six Sunday evening addresses on "Christianity in Common Life." There was a good attendance, and the address was listened to with marked attention.

The address appeared in the *Liverpool Mercury* of the 9th January. We make the following quotations, which, we venture to think, will be read with interest by our readers :—

CHRISTIANITY, A WORKING-MAN'S RELIGION.

Now, for one moment, look at the beginning of Christianity, and ask yourselves whether or not it was intended to be a working-man's religion, or whether it was intended to be buttressed by church establishments, and to be the support of thrones and aristocracies. Jesus Christ was the son of a carpenter of Nazareth in Galilee. He was brought up in the cottage of a working-man—and, mind you, this is not with me, whatever it may be with many of my fellow believers, a matter of theological device or economy: Jesus Christ is not, to me—I speak reverently of the opinions of those who differ from me—Jesus Christ is not with me the Almighty God come down from heaven to take human shape: he is simply a man like myself, a man born in honest wedlock, the son of poor, industrious parents. Tradition says—and in this case tradition may be trusted—that when he was a boy he worked at his father's trade. There is no reason why we should not suppose that he so worked until the time came for him to go out into the world; that he earned his bread honestly, as you earn it, by the sweat of his brow. He had no great education. There were no schools and universities in those days; at least, if there were, they were far away in Greece and Rome, not among the hills of Galilee. What did he learn? He learnt what the elders had to teach him; he read in the grand old Bible in which we read now, and had the springs of patriotic ardour unlocked in his breast by the stories which we teach our children at this day. But he lived with God. He grew up in the sight of God as a plant grows up fair and beautiful in the sun, and when the time came that God put words on his lips—words that were never to die—did he go out with any great apparatus of teaching, with any royal equipage? Nay, he walked from village to village, from town to town, accepting the simple hospitality of the country folk, talking with them in their streets, preaching to them in their synagogues, drawing the illustrations of his doctrine from their common daily life; nay, he endured the hatred and the scorn of his own people by choosing out the most degraded classes for his companions, sitting down to meat with publicans, and not disdaining offices of love from the harlot. Think of him now, think of him as one of yourselves: think of him as a man coming out of your own workshops with the word of God upon his lips; think of him going about the streets of this great wicked city, seeing the gleam of purity in the poor prostitute's face, and leading her back to a life of purity and goodness. Think of him here looking down with love and help upon the poor friendless drunkard, whom men have given up as utterly worthless: think of a Christ like that coming and taking him by the hand and lifting him up into the possibility of self-respect. This carpenter's son, who lived with the people, who drew all his life from the people, who accepted the hospitality of the people, who did not know from day to day where to lay his head, who was content to be a mendicant for the love of God and the work he had to do—is that a prophet of aristocracies and heirarchies? Is that one, do you think, whom working men can afford to pass by, and not at least to listen to what he has to say? It seems to me the strangest and most melancholy of all changes, that men of Christ's own craft—the men by whose side he might have worked if he had been with us now—should be passing by on the other side and saying, "What have we to do with thee?"

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

Now, there was one doctrine which Christ had perpetually upon his lips: he was always talking of a kingdom. Sometimes he called it a kingdom of God,

Digitized by Google

sometimes he called it the kingdom of heaven. It was the object of his coming upon earth to set on foot and inaugurate that kingdom. He begins his public ministry in St Matthew's Gospel by declaring who are the subjects of that kingdom. They are the meek, they are the poor in spirit, they are the peacemakers, they are the mourners, they are, in short, the great mass of undistinguished obscure men—men like you and me, my friends, who have no claim to be looked upon with favour by the rich and the great, but who for all that have got hearts to love God and men, and consciences to do God's work, and a desire to make our life a little stronger and a little better than it is now. There was to be no visible entrance into this kingdom; it was to reign in men's hearts, it was to make a change there; it was to abolish selfishness, it was to do away with pride and cruelty, it was to substitute pity and forgiveness for the harsher qualities which then led men to fame and fortune. Above all, it was to cleanse the life at its very issues, and to make men pure and good, loving God and doing His will. And Christ's great idea for the renovation of society, one which he expressed over and over again in different parables—in the parable of the leaven hidden in the meal, in the parable of the grain of mustard seed—was this, that there was no earthly way of reforming society except to reform the individual; that if he could only gather round him just two or three faithful hearts—men who were penetrated with his spirit, men who for the sake of him would try to serve God in their day and generation—that little by little the fire would spread, as it runs among the stubble, and the gospel would have its widened way, and the kingdom would grow and extend, and all at once men would find that if they loved God, and that if they loved their brethren, with their whole hearts, the entire work of renovating society would be at an end, that, if only this were so, all the evils of that day—yes, my brethren, and all the evils, and the woes, and the sorrows of our day too—would disappear like the mists before the morning sun.

HOW INTEMPERANCE IS PRODUCED.

I believe that a very large part of the intemperance of this town, and of all other towns like this, is just simply produced by the unhealthy conditions under which people live. When a man has been sleeping in a room perhaps with seven or eight people more, young and old—a small room with, you may be sure, a bag up the chimney, and, in all likelihood, newspapers pasted round the windows, in order that there may be no communication with the outer air—when in this way he has been breathing diluted poison for so many hours, he gets up next morning—how? Why, with a feverish skin, an unrefreshed head, and a throbbing heart; and he has to go to the ginshop round the corner to get something to put him in tune for his work before he can begin. You may find thousands of instances of this kind for yourself. They are too common in our daily life. But, then, on the other hand, I am perfectly willing to admit that it is a triumph of human nature to get the better of those things; but, alas, the too rare triumph!

WHAT CHRISTIANITY CAN DO.

When I see some poor girl struck down by consumption, and wasting away her life from day to day in some mean, comfortless room, with but poor attendance, and knowing only too surely that the tide of life is ebbing away from her heart—when I see her bearing her recurring and increasing pains with perpetually augmented patience, affectionately thankful for the smallest attention of love, willing, even in the last extremity, to deny herself for the sake of others, and going at last to her God with a smile upon her lips and a hope in her heart, then I see the triumph of the soul over the body, and what Christianity can do to make us independent of this poor fleshly integument in which we live.

It is a most fearful fact to think of, that in every heart there is some secret spring that would be weak at the touch of temptation, and that is liable to be assailed. Fearful and yet salutary to think of; for the thought may serve to keep our moral nature braced. It warns us that we can never stand at ease, or lie down in this field of life, without sentinels of watchfulness, and campfires of prayer.

We must die alone. To the very verge of the stream our friends may accompany us, they may bend over us, they may cling to us there; but that one long wave from the sea of eternity washes up to the lips, sweeps us from the shore, and we go forth alone! In that untried and utter solitude, then, what can there be for us but the pulsation of that assurance—"I am not alone, because the Father is with me!"

Digitized by Google

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Unitarian Missionary.

Dear Sir,—If your new Magazine succeeds in stirring up our Congregations to the duty of making our Unitarian opinions known to the larger classes who hold no opinions or mistaken opinions on religion, it will, indeed, do a great work. I know of few more praiseworthy efforts than that of spreading religious truth, which is in most cases the same as winning minds from painful doubt, and perhaps from irreligion, to a trust in a good God. The gross errors of the so-called orthodoxy are such as to have driven nearly one half of our nation from the open profession of religion, from teaching religion to their children, and from wishing their families to be religious. It is to these classes that we should more particularly address ourselves. And all efforts in this direction will have as good a moral effect upon ourselves as upon our neighbours. Our most healthy Congregations are those that are trying to spread their opinions, and increase their numbers. Those that do not, may conceal their idleness and indifference under such remarks as that they do not like proselytizing, that they do not wish to shake the opinions of others; they may be large in their numbers, because they have an admired preacher; but they have in them the seeds of decay. And fortunate it is for us that the laws by which the world is governed soon make neglect of duty felt; such congregations always decline when the temporary cause of prosperity is removed.

But exhortation to efforts has far less power than example has; and if your Magazine can supply us with the information of what the busy, active Congregations are doing, with a view to spread their Unitarianism, you will do us a service. Such information cannot be too minute. Nothing is trifling in a matter of importance. We want to hear what is being done in doctrinal lectures, in Bible-classes by the minister, in mutual instruction classes, in tract distributing, in efforts to win the Sunday School into the Congregation, making Congregational libraries, and spreading abroad our Unitarian periodicals, and Unitarian books. It is from our smaller Congregations that such hints are chiefly to be gained. Their small numbers stir them up to the necessity of winning members; and thus they are encouraged by self-interest to do what we all ought to do from a sense of duty. In a small Congregation we often find the wholesome religious zeal which often is wanting in the large Congregation. In a large body of people, many are only following the stream. They do not go to their chapel in earnestness, but because others do. If they confessed the truth, they would, many of them, say with the poet of religious indifference,

"I go to Mecca with the caravan."

And if the crowd took them to the temple of Rimmon, I fear that some would go there. Now, a small Congregation is a body of worshippers who have the courage to quit the crowd. And it is from such that I think you may gain most information to encourage and guide our missionary efforts.—Wishing you all success, I am, yours faithfully,

SAMUEL SHARPE.

32 Highbury Place,
2d Jan. 1872.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

SUGGESTIONS FOR PARENTS, SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS, & FOR SELF-IMPROVEMENT.

Christianity, as taught by Jesus, consists of a few great facts or principles. To persons, who have been accustomed freely to think over Jesus' words and deeds, the soul of Christ seems to have been filled with love. Love God; and, Love man is his well known command. This is the Unitarian way of looking at Christianity; but this, it is quite clear, is not the way the people we meet every day of our lives have been taught to think of Jesus and his work. In England, the Prayer-book to many has the place of honor assigned to it. In Scotland, the Shorter Catechism; and the same is no doubt the case in the north of Ireland; and in those districts little children are, in their early years, taught to regard the lessons thus given, from somewhat different books, as the pure bread of Life." We certainly do not blame those, who believe the creeds and catechisms of their churches to contain the true knowledge of

Digitized by Google

Christianity, for wishing to teach their children their own view of truth. But it is not an indication of unkindness towards them on our part when we earnestly desire to afford them something better. It is not much that the Unitarian Sunday School Teacher requires to teach. But what he has to give should be presented in such a way that the pupil will not fail to see and know the fact for him or herself. Let the teacher feel that it is a serious responsibility to attempt to give the knowledge of God and of duty to the young. In taking a class for the first time, the teacher should do as a shopkeeper does when he takes a new business. Let him take stock of his class, gently and completely test them, in order to learn what ideas or thoughts they have already been led to form of God, of Jesus, of goodness, and of duty.

We offer an illustration. Suppose we have in a class a dozen children we may never have seen before, but we hope to have regularly as scholars. Perhaps one-half or more of them are strangers to the chapel. We may at once conclude that the children will have already had given them a form of words at least to supply an answer to such a question as the following, designed to test the conception the children have of the character of the heavenly Father. We ask the question, "Does God love you when you do wrong?" The children will, in many cases, reply emphatically, No! With the class, now, we have a real work to perform, —it is nothing less than to endeavour, as disciples of Jesus, to set these children right as to the way in which the Heavenly Father regards the badly-behaving child. The child has a conviction that the kindness of God towards it depends upon its own conduct. We do not ask whether this thought of the child is useful, but rather, is it true? How are we to deal with our class? The New Testament offers us a help. We turn to the 5th chapter of Matthew, and ask the children to begin to read from the 43d verse to the end. If we feel we cannot say anything beyond the words of Jesus, we pass on to the 15th chapter of Luke, reading from the 11th verse the story of the younger son who went so far away from his Father, showing how the Father did not cease to love his child; or Romans xii.; or 1 Cor. xiii., here taking care to turn the word "charity" into "love." Then we make the application. Do not the children feel that, although their bad conduct make their own mothers weep, yet their mothers could not help loving them? Is not God, then, kind to "the unthankful and the evil?" This lesson is one of the first that we should try to teach to a single child or to a Sunday School Class. We do not expect that a class, such as we have supposed, would thoroughly appreciate at first the important truth of God's unfailing love. Much depends upon the teacher, who will fall back upon this position when he or she wishes to give rise, in the souls of the children, to the pure emotions of faith and hope. The work of a Sunday School Teacher is a noble one. We shall be glad to hear from any teacher who may have found our remarks useful and suggestive.

ANSWERS TO OUR QUESTIONS ON THE BIBLE.

1. Cyrus, on allowing the Jews to return home, was preparing for an invasion of the great kingdom of Egypt; and the prophet describes the Almighty as saying that he would give to Cyrus Egypt and Ethiopia as a ransom for letting the Jews go free. This ransom was actually paid to Cambyses, son of Cyrus, who did conquer Egypt.

2. Cyrus appointed as his viceroy or governor of Judea, Jerubbabel. Xerxes I. appointed Ezra. Artaxerxes Longimanus appointed Nehemiah. These three viceroys were all native Jews.

3. On the invasion of Judea by Sennacherib, Isaiah advised a resolute resistance. On the invasion by Nebuchadnezzar, Jeremiah advised submission. In both cases the advice seems to have been wise. *Note.*—In asking the second half of this question we unfortunately wrote Isaiah for Jeremiah.

4. Athaliah was the only queen who reigned over Judea. She gained the throne of Judah when Jehu had at the same moment killed Ahaziah, king of Judah, and Jehoram, king of Israel.

5. By the Mosaic law a creditor might seize from a debtor every article of his clothing except his large wrapping cloak. That he was obliged to leave with him as a necessary covering to sleep in at night. This is correctly expressed in Matt. v. 20. But in Luke it is misunderstood, and the under garment is there spoken of as the one which would be last taken away from the man.

6. In 1 Samuel viii. 15, the Israelites are told by the prophet that if they appoint a king to rule over them he will take the tythe of the produce of their fields. This is what Solomon probably did The tythe seems to have been a royal tax, which was, after a time, collected by the Levites, and then claimed by them as their own.

Digitized by Google

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

WE begin with begging our pupils to get themselves a Greek Testament, and Grammar; and, if not in reach otherwise, Griesbach's Greek Testament, for 1s. 3d., may be had post free from H. Brace, 178 Strand, London; and Hamilton's Greek Grammar, Weale's Series, price 1s., can be had from any bookseller.

But to our task.

The little word *the*, which in English serves us for all numbers, cases and genders, has in Greek twenty different variations. We give it below declined (or showing its changes), first calling attention to the curious circumstance of the Dual Number, or a different way of spelling a word when exactly two are meant, from the same word when only one or else several are spoken of.

For pronunciation—Remember the aspirates, thus sound the nominative singular *ho*, *he*, *toe*, and the nominative plural *hoy*, *hi*, *tay*. When αι occurs, sound it i, thus, dative plural feminine, ταις *to the*, sound *tice*, as in the word *nice*. Sound the long ω in των *of the*, strong as in our words *tone*, *alone*, while the word τον, spelt with a short ο, is to be sounded as in *tonic*, or *tonsure*.

Notice the little i under each last letter in the dative singular, called the iota subscripta, or *i written under;* but it is not sounded. Originally it was the last letter of the word, and to show it was not to be sounded it got written below.

The Definite Article ὁ *The.*

Singular.

	Masculine.	Feminine.	Neuter.	
Nominative	ὁ	ἡ	το	the
Genitive	του	της	του	of the
Dative	τῳ	τῃ	τῳ	to the
Accusative	τον	την	το	the

Dual.

Nominative, Accusative	τω	τα	τω	the
Genitive, Dative	τοιν	ταιν	τοιν	of the, to the

Plural.

Nominative	οἱ	αἱ	τα	the
Genitive	των	των	των	of the
Dative	τοις	ταις	τοις	to the
Accusative	τους	τας	τα	the

Greek has no indefinite article, so, in translating into English, we often have to add the word *a;* but the definite article *the*, is sometimes one of the important words in a sentence, and must neither be left out, nor added. Our lesson below has several places where it makes no difference how we translate it, as whether we say *the wind*, or *a wind*, *the rock*, or *a rock;* and the Authorised Version says *a rock* where it should be *the rock*, and the mistake is unimportant; but we shall in future lessons come to passages where it is of the highest importance. Now, we will turn to the lesson below, and notice when we meet with it there.

Matt. vii. 24.

1 Πας ουν ὁστις ακουει μου τους
Every [one] therefore who heareth of me the
2 λογους τουτους, και ποιει αυτους, ὁμοιωσω
words these, and doeth them I will liken
3 αυτον ανδρι φρονιμῳ, ὁστις ῳκοδομησε
him to a man prudent who built
4 την οικιαν αὑτου επι την πετραν· και
the house of him upon the rock; and
5 κατεβη ἡ βροχη, και ηλθον οἱ ποταμοι,
down went the rain, and came the floods,
6 και επνευσαν οἱ ανεμοι, και προσεπεσον τῃ
and blew the winds, and fell upon the
7 οικιᾳ εκεινῃ· και ουκ επεσε· τεθεμελιωτο
house that and not it fell; it had been founded
8 γαρ επι την πετραν· Και πας ὁ
for upon the rock. And every the [one]
9 ακουων μου τους λογους τουτους και μη
hearing of me the words these and not
10 ποιων αυτους, ὁμοιωθησεται ανδρι μωρῳ,
doing them, shall be likened to a man foolish,
11 ὁστις ῳκοδομησε την οικιαν αὑτου επι την
who built the house of him upon the
12 αμμον· και κατεβη ἡ βροχη, και ηλθον
sand; and down went the rain, and came
13 οἱ ποταμοι, και επνευσαν οἱ ανεμοι, και
the floods and blew the winds, and
14 προσεκοψαν τῃ οικιᾳ εκεινῃ· και επεσε·
beat upon the house that; and it fell;
15 και ην ἡ πτωσις αυτης μεγαλη·
and was the fall of it great.

Here we have the word *the* seventeen times, and with six different variations in

Digitized by Google

the Greek. Notice, on lines 6 and 14, the word τῇ *the* has the *iota subscripta* of the dative case, and that in both places the two next words have the *iota* also under them, marking that they also are in the dative case. So, on lines 1 and 9, the two words following τοὺς *the*, both end in the same three last letters that the article does, marking that they are all in the same case, accusative, masculine plural. So, also, each time οἱ *the* occurs, the noun that follow ends with οι, showing it is nominative masculine plural. And now we will set our pupils during the month to learn the Article by heart. It will be invaluable at every turn. When you know the article, you know the endings of many adjectives, pronouns, and even nouns. For very many of them are declined with their endings like the Article, except the first word ὁ gets changed into ος.

Next month we hope to talk a little about the Verbs.

WHO ARE TO DO THE MASTER'S WORK?

IN the course of a conversation held lately with a member of one of our large Unitarian congregations, we were led to express our views with reference to the responsibility resting upon those who have obtained for themselves a knowledge of the Unitarian thought of Jesus and his good news. We think they may not be unworthy of the attention of our readers. It is a well-known fact that in many of our churches there are men and women of high culture, possessing great power for receiving the deepest religious sentiment. We sometimes hear one of these expressing strong attachment to a minister because he is able to pour into their willing minds the result of his study and thought on the great theme of religion. Regret is expressed if through sickness or other cause the regular minister's place needs to be filled by a stranger, possibly a man of less culture or less religious fervour.

We wish to look at this subject as it might appear in the presence of Jesus. Then, ought any devout Christian, who is sensible of the blessedness and value of the gospel, to carry into the church,—in which the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, the care-worn and the happy, the poor widow and the glad wife and mother, the lonely orphan and the family without loss, all meet as members one of the other, —an intensely selfish feeling, and expect to receive, even though it might pass like empty sounds over the unfortunate and ignorant, the highest expressions fitted to convey, in a subtle and poetic manner, the thoughts which he alone can love and thoroughly appreciate? The words of Jesus remind us of the answer, "I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." We cannot help thinking it is an error on the part of those who have, through the favourable circumstances that have attended their lives, been led into the Christian Church, to in any way divert the healing waters of the river of life into artificial channels to adorn the homes of the few, while the many perish for want. The question we ask is simply, "Who is to do the Master's work?" Who is it that must take the bread to the perishing? Can it be expected that the men who are termed the ministers of Christ can do all the work? We fear it is often felt that the Christian minister is regarded as the only person upon whom rests the responsibility of bringing home to men the need of piety and love. And never does this appear with more melancholy force than when we hear the complaint, "Mr — is to preach to-day, therefore, of course, I shall not be in my place." Mr — is perhaps not to blame for his defects. The vacant seats may help to increase the roughness of his voice, and add to the nervousness of his utterance; and those of the congregation who come in all weathers and to all preachers will perhaps notice the absence of the selfish Christian. We would indeed hope that there is no conscious neglect of Jesus' request to his disciples, to give as freely as they had received, oftentimes chargeable to those who project their individual desires beyond the necessities of others, who have not been blessed so abundantly. Possibly it would be a help to a minister if he were assured that the most devoted of his people desired he would even ignore their presence, that those for whom Christ came might be filled. Let us all be "labourers together with God."

Digitized by Google

MISSIONARY WORK.

From our Own Correspondents.

GLOSSOP.

It has long been thought deirable to make an effort to establish a Unitarian place of worship in this town. Accordingly, a series of lectures on Liberal Christianity are being delivered under the auspices of the East Cheshire Christian Union, in the Town hall. The first was given by the Rev. S. A. Steinthal, on "A Free and Honest Theology the Want of the Age." This was followed by the Rev. J. Black, on "The Religion of the Churches Tested by the Teachings of Jesus;" by the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed, on "The Bible;" by the Rev. H. E. Dowson, on "Human Nature and Salvation;" and the "Unity of God," by the Rev. J. K. Smith. All these lectures have been well attended. At some of them there were over three hundred persons present. At the close of each lecture questions were allowed to be put to the lecturer, and many availed themselves of the opportunity. In several instances very animated discussions have been carried on, both by orthodox ministers and laymen; and in order to discuss the subjects more fully, the Revs. P. H. Wicksteed and H. E. Dowson were asked to give their opponents two more evenings, as they would be better prepared to meet them; to which request the revs. gentlemen readily assented. We have also been lectured against in the town; and letters have appeared in the local papers, setting forth what the writers consider to be the unreasonable and unscriptural doctrines of Unitarianism. The efforts of the platform have been followed by the distribution of a large number of tracts. We hope that these lectures will lead to the establishment of a place of worship in this town.

WALSALL.

We are glad to know that good missionary work is being done at Walsall. The chapel, which had been closed for four years, was reopened six months ago by the Midland Christian Union, who appointed the Rev. W. W. Robinson their missionary. A large number of controversial tracts have been put into circulation, declarations of the Unitarian faith posted about the town, courses of doctrinal lectures delivered, classes formed, one for the study of the Greek Testament,—and the result is, that a considerable number of inquirers have been interested, and in the evening a congregation of from sixty to seventy adults, most of whom knew nothing of our faith six months ago, is got together.

One feature of the Sunday evening lectures is, we think, worthy of general adoption in opening up new spheres of Unitarian effort. It consists in requesting those who wish for more information on any of the subjects lectured upon, or the elucidation of any doctrinal or textual difficulty, to propose it to the minister in a written form, with the promise that it shall be taken up or commented upon the following Sunday evening. It has proved very successful at Walsall.

Perhaps we ought to say that the offertory has been adopted almost from the beginning of the services, and yields more than the congregation has at any time subscribed for the last twenty years.

COUPAR-ANGUS, SCOTLAND.

The Dundee *Argus* understands that the member of the U. P. Church at Coupar-Angus who seconded Mr J. Robertson's motion, after a lecture by Rev H Williamson, on Hell, recently received a citation from his kirk-session. He has written his session, requesting them to withdraw his name from the communion-roll.

IRELAND.

During the last month, the efforts to revive the cause at Ballymena have been continued, with greater prospect of success. An arrangement has been made with the Rev David Matts, of Ballymoney, to conduct the evening service for two months.

In Belfast two courses of lectures have been delivered—one in the Second Presbyterian Church, by the Rev. J. C. Street, and the other in York Street Church, by the Revs. J. Jellie, J. Orr, D. Gordon, D. Thompson, W. Hall, and D. Matts. The attendance at both churches was very satisfactory.

In Downpatrick, the Rev. David Gordon, who has been recently appointed assistant and successor to the Rev. S. C. Nelson, has been engaged in delivering a course of lectures on various interesting subjects. Mr Gordon has been assisted in the course by several ministers in the district.

At Moneyrea the Rev. David Thompson has commenced a series of services in the outlying districts around his church. The first service was held in Meaburgh Masonic Hall, and was attended by about seventy persons.

We have to express our thanks for the manner in-which the "Missionary" has been received. We can probably now reckon upon a sale of 2,000. Several friends have kindly aided us by subscribing for a dozen copies per month for distribution. Others have asked us to give the "Missionary" to suitable persons in Scotland, for which they have sent us funds.

We have also to thank those friends who have given us donations to assist in the bringing out of the "Missionary." There has been found a general willingness to take our paper on its being seen. If our present subscribers would kindly bring it under the notice of their friends, we do not doubt but that the sale may be largely increased. Two copies can be sent, post free, for a year, direct from the Editor, for 2s. 6d.; one copy, 1s. 6d. Chapel-keepers and others who will undertake to sell the "Missionary" can order it through Hall & Co., 25 Paternoster Row, London.

Copies of No. 1. may still be had from the Editor.

Digitized by Google

UNIVERSALISM.

THROUGH the doctrines of Universalism, I expect sin to be overcome. I have no hope for the race only as it is the outcome of my faith. Wellington is said to have rested on a certain hollow square, by which he won the great battle of Waterloo, after defeat was imminent; and so I rest myself upon the doctrine of Universalism, which with me is synonymous with Christianity; and through it I expect the world to be conquered. Do you say, I am using small weapons for great purposes; that these doctrines are but the pebbles of the brook, which David will take to kill the Goliath of wickedness and sin. Look at them! See what they are! Look at the doctrine of God's Fatherhood! All denominations believe it, I am told, constantly. Yes; but nevertheless, they do not believe it as we do; for the doctrine of God's fatherhood means what Christ taught us in that beautiful parable in 15th of Luke: "What man of you, having a hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness and go after that which is lost, until he find it?" Mark the words—"*until he find it.*" Not search until he concludes it is hopelessly lost, or until he is wearied and abandons the search; He said no such thing as that; but search "*until he find it.*" Up amid craggy mountains; down into deep, dark ravines; in the teeth of the tornado,—search "*until he find it,*" sometime, somewhere. Then what? "And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders rejoicing." Mark the language again,—it is not mine but Christ's,—"rejoicing more over it than over the ninety and nine that went not astray." And so, friends, if we hug ourselves in pharisaical self-complacency, and imagine ourselves higher in the regard of God than the poor drunken brother in the gutter, than the poor fallen sister, from whom we gather our skirts as we pass, lest contact be pollution, Christ has taught us differently, for he has taught us that God, who has all that there is of love in his nature,—the love of father, mother, brother, sister,—a love that is infinite, eternal, overwhelming and omnipotent,—Christ has taught us that God our Father will pass us by, who need no salvation, and hunt for the poor brother or the lost sister *until he find them*, and then rejoice more over them than over us, who need no salvation.

So, I say we mean more by the doctrine of God's fatherhood than do the other denominations. But let me tell you that this doctrine can be believed by the world. The doctrine of God's fatherhood can penetrate down into the heart, when oppressed by sin, anxious, despairing about the future, going along through the world in the great trouble that comes to every one, lonely, beset within and without. We cannot make our passage through life carrying this great seed-truth of God's fatherhood in our hearts and talking it to others, without producing a good effect. —*Mrs Livermore, at the Universalist Centenary.*

If any one maintains reform as a substitute for Christianity, he attributes to the stream the virtues of the fountain; he ascribes to the arteries the central function of the heart. For from Christianity beats the great pulse of this world's hope.

THE BROAD CREED.

Truth is one;
And in all lands beneath the sun,
Whoso hath eyes to see may see
The tokens of its unity.
No scroll of creed its fulness warps,
We trace it not by schoolboy maps,
Free as the sun and air it is
Of latitudes and boundaries.
In Vedic verse, in dull Koran,
Are messages of God to man;
The angels to our Aryan sires
Talked by the earliest household fires.

Nor doth it lessen what He taught,
Or make the gospel Jesus brought
Less precious, that his lips retold
Some portions of that truth of old:
Denying not the proven seers,
The tested wisdom of the years;
Confirming with his own impress
The common law of righteousness.
We search the world for truth; we cull
The good, the pure, the beautiful
From graven stone and written scroll,
From all old flower-fields of the soul;
And, weary seekers of the best,
We come back laden from our quest,
To find that all the sages said
Is in the book our mother read.
And all our treasure of old thought
In His harmonious fulness wrought,
Who gathers in one sheaf complete
The shattered blades of God's own wheat.
The common growth that maketh good
His all embracing Fatherhood,
Wherever through the ages rise
The altars of self-sacrifice,
Where love its arms has opened wide,
Or man for man has calmly died.
I see the same white wings outspread
That hovered o'er the Master's head!
I trace His presence in the blind
Pathetic groupings of my kind—
In prayers for sin and sorrow wrung,
In cradle hymns of life they sung,
Each in his measure but a part
Of the unmeasured Over-Heart;
And with a stronger faith, confess
The greater that it owns the less.

Nor fear I aught that science brings
From searching through material things,
Content to let its glasses prove,
Not by the letter's oldness move
The myriad worlds on worlds that course
The spaces of the universe;
Since everywhere the spirit walks
The gardens of the heart, and talks
With man as under Eden's trees,
In all its varied languages.
Why mourn above some hopeless flaw
When Scripture every day afresh
Is traced on tables of the flesh?
By inward sense, by outward sighs,
God's presence still the heart divines!
Through deepest joy of Him we learn,
In sorest grief to Him we turn,
And reason stoops in pride to share
The childlike instinct of a prayer.

Whittier's Miriam.

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

No. 3. MARCH 1872. PRICE 1D.

JUSTIFICATION.

By the Rev. JOHN R. BEARD, D.D.

JUSTIFICATION and justify are Scriptural terms of frequent occurence. Latin in their origin, they are magical formulas by which ecclesiastical conjurors make men righteous while they are unrighteous, and clean while they remain unclean. When education in England is something which deserves the name, the theological trick will be impossible. For what is the exact meaning of to "justify" but to make just? and of "justification" but the act of making just? Such is the root meaning of the terms, which, consisting of the Latin *justus* (English, just), and *facere* (to make); *facere* is found in our *fact*, which thus means something *made* or done; hence, too, our *factory*, a making or working place;—justification has for its first and essential import the idea of making a person just. This, the first and essential import, the reader must cleave to, not turning aside to any other, except on good and sufficient reasons. He must, moreover, be careful to accept the terms in their real meaning. "Just" with him must signify just, really just. And, in order that he may be sure that in the particular case the real meaning is kept to, he will do well to employ in its stead some synonym—that is, some word having the same or nearly the same sense. Substitute, then, righteous (a term which in Scripture often represents the original Hebrew and Greek words), and say that justification is making a man righteous. And, in order to be sure that you are not still misled, ask, is the man whom you declare justified a righteous man? An unrighteous man he was, you say; can you truly say that he is now a righteous man? If the answer is "Yes," you are on the right road. If the "Yes" is not prompt and explicit, suspect danger, you are probably near some theological trap. For instance, suppose the answer to be—"Well, hardly yet, but he will be, and in the sight of God he may be said to be." Here is the trap. The answer is a mere evasion. As a simple fact the man is not righteous, and whether he ever will be righteous is far more than your collocutor can tell; there is, indeed, small chance of his being made really righteous under a system which has for one of its fundamental notions this, namely, that God sees things the opposite of what they are, inasmuch as the unrighteous are righteous in his eyes. The same process of thought, and the same result may be obtained with the aid of the word virtuous, or the term morally pure. So long as a radical moral transformation is not a consequence of justification, the process, whatever it may be, is but nominal. In other words, it is a species of theological legerdemain. By no means uncommon is this slight-of-hand in certain circles of the so-called Christian Church. The Pope is called "his holiness," as the Queen is

Digitized by Google

called "her majesty," though he may be as little holy in truth as the Queen is personally majestic. In both, these are complimentary titles of office. But can the ordinary Christian be satisfied with such chaff? On such chaff can the spiritual life be fed and nurtured into vital strength? This titular religion runs through the popular systems. It is embedded in the common doctrine of Atonement. In popery it lives and riots. No matter how wicked a Pope may be (and some Popes have been very wicked), yet is he not merely "his holiness," but he is holy. And so in every priest. In a "holy church" every being and every thing is holy—in this sense of the term holy—that is, as being connected with a system which throughout holds and propagates official holiness—that is sham holiness, outside holiness, unreal holiness, holiness —not of heart and life, but of position and privilege. It is the prerogative of every person in the papal priesthood to be called, accounted, and treated as holy, however unholy he may be. In such cases there is no justification at all, but rather an intense inflation.

Let us pass from these words of Latin origin, and take, as far as we can, to plain Saxon English. Here is one who claims to have undergone the renewing process of justification. Is he then given to truth? Do his neighbours account him a good man? Can he endure the test of doing as he would be done by? Does he give a fair day's work for a fair day's wages? Is he kind at home! Is he rough or mild in his manner? Does he command his tongue? Alas! it is true that these qualities are commonly held to have little or nothing to do with religion. O yes; a man may have undergone justification and yet be in the habit of breaking this or that article of the Ten Commandments, and care as little about the beatitudes as if they had never been uttered by Christ. What delusion! What ruinous delusion! The day of such hollowness is rapidly passing away. The souls of men cannot be fed on words. After such meals they are hungry, thirsty, and faint; and but for the fear of Satan and the priest they would seek more satisfactory pasture. Cannot the reader do something to remove that fear? The feast of fat things provided in the words and life of Jesus is as attractive as nutritious. Who will go out and compel the famishing to come and sit down at the table of "the Son of man?"

A FEW THOUGHTS ON AN ENDLESS HELL.

THE belief in an Endless Hell is one so dreadful, and involves consequences of so serious a nature, that it is surprising any person of a sensitive mind should succeed in entertaining it. It is truly awful to think of human beings living on in intensest agony through a period of ceaseless duration. Their pitiful condition, if a fact, would go to prove the Deity wanting either in power or in goodness. If there are to be creatures suffering torments forever, it can only be because their Maker cannot or will not save them; and in either case the Divine character is made to suffer. And this unhappy alternative should open the eyes of Christian people to the foulness of the popular doctrine as to the future lot of the sinful. If the power to save all men is denied to the Deity, then an essential attribute of Godhead is denied to him; and if it is denied that he purposes to save all men, then an equally essential attribute is denied to him—that of infinite goodness.

> "Goodness and being in the gods are one:
> He who imputes ill to them makes them none."

So said Euripides, and so say we. Goodness and being mean the same thing for the Deity; and as an endless hell is opposed to perfect goodness, the advocates of its existence are in reality guilty of what amounts to gross impiety.

And further, is it even reasonable to think that those who are so fortunate as to get to heaven will be happy there while it is known to them that others—a vast number—are in a state of hopeless misery? It would seem not. Rather is there good reason to think heaven would be only a miserable place under such circumstances. Every man whose heart beats true feels pity for those who are in pain and distress —feels a weight on his own soul when he views a fellow-man bearing a burden of

Digitized by Google

sorrow, and is not satisfied till he has done his best to lighten or remove it. And is it to be for a moment supposed that such a man would be happy in heaven while there was a single soul suffering pain eternal? Can we imagine that John Howard, whose life was spent in relieving misery, could be happy among those who had gone up higher, with the thought perpetually haunting his mind that numbers were suffering in another place without one single ray of hope? We should do him immense injustice if we supposed it possible for him to be other than miserable under the circumstances. And it is no wonder there are minds that recoil at the thought of having to go to heaven if there is to be an eternal hell alongside of it.

> "It will not take a heaven
> Haunted by shrieks of far-off misery,"

says George Eliot; and every one whose heart is not unacquainted with pity will readily respond to his sentiment with a sincere Amen. That sentiment is a noble one. For a heaven so haunted would be no heaven at all; and to dwell in it would be a curse and not a blessing.

And it would only be making bad matters worse to suppose, as some people do, that the saved will undergo a change which will render them insensible to the misery of the lost, or which will ever cause them to rejoice over the latter's bad state. Such a change would be a terrible misfortune. Insensibility to suffering is not accounted a commendable quality among living Christian people, and pleasure at the sight of another person's pain is esteemed nothing short of diabolical. If, then, on reaching heaven, a man is to be so changed as to possess qualities which are commonly esteemed as the very opposite to virtuous here, his going there cannot be justly considered a going up higher, but a going lower. To have to cast off sensibility to suffering and misery would be to cast off what is noblest and divinest in human character. And we are justified, therefore, in declining to believe in an eternity of pain and sorrow for even a single human creature. It is rational enough to believe in future suffering, limited in duration—suffering that is corrective—that is inflicted with a view to the ultimate good of the sufferer. But belief in an eternity of suffering involves consequences too dreadful for us to adopt it. Surely a man will be permitted to be as good, as benevolent, as merciful, at the very least, in heaven as he is able to be on earth; and surely the Heavenly Father is as tender and loving as the most tender and loving of his own children. And this being so, the sinful will not be left to suffer for ever, nor their misery deprive the sainted ones above of peace and joy. The hereafter, it must be, will give scope for deeds of mercy and healing.

> "For sure, in heaven's wide chambers there is room
> For love and pity, and for helpful deeds:
> Else were our summons thither but a doom
> To life more vain than this in clayey weeds."

It is pleasant and edifying to think of the future life in this hopeful manner. If we shall carry with us all our noblest sentiments, our tenderest sympathies, if our hearts shall cherish their purest affections and continue to feel pity for the sorrowing, then heaven will be a happy and desirable place, and to enter it will be a real blessing.

J. G. S.

THE LIFE AND VIGOUR AWAKENED BY CONTROVERSY.

DR CHANNING said of himself, that he naturally shrank from controversy, and that his doctrinal sermons had been to him a work of duty rather than a pleasure. Now, since we ourselves are at times called upon in our several ways to take up the defence of our religious opinions, at the sacrifice of our ease and quietness, and it may be at the sacrifice of our other opportunities of usefulness, it is interesting to us to gather from the incidents of Channing's life that the Unitarian Controversy, into which he was so unwillingly drawn, did more than simply answer its purpose at the moment. It had a far deeper and higher influence. The zeal and activity of mind which it called into life presently returned back upon those who had exerted themselves in it, giving to them, and all around them, a fresh supply of courage and strength. It is not,

Digitized by Google

too much to say that the new duties and unaccustomed work now laid upon him changed Channing himself from the quiet, painstaking pastor of a church in America, into one of the great leaders of religious thought, and of the religious reformation of the world, whose theological writings have been translated into half a dozen different languages, and will continue to be read, we know not how widely or to what distant time. The little history of the rise of the Unitarian church at Baltimore, and of the part Channing took in helping it forward, will serve to show the way in which one courageous effort made for the support of our religious opinions draws after it another, kindling life and gathering strength as it goes onwards.

So far back as 1785, in the days of Channing's childhood, and not long after Lindsey had given up his church-living in Yorkshire to preach as a Unitarian in Essex Street Chapel, London, Dr Freeman —the pastor of an Episcopal Congregation in Boston, America—followed the attempt Lindsey had made to reform the Church Services, and, with the approval of his flock, published a revision of the Book of Common Prayer for their use, and gave a course of lectures upon the doctrines left out in his new prayer-book. In fact, making this, the oldest Episcopal Church in New England, something very like Unitarian.

Thirty years after this, in 1816, at the time that Channing and his brother ministers in Boston were engaged in the Unitarian Controversy above alluded to, we find Dr Freeman going over to Baltimore to give some lectures on Rational Christianity, and helping the people there to establish a religious Society. These Baltimore Unitarians built themselves a Chapel, and carved over the stonework the inscription in Greek, *To the King, eternal, invisible, the only wise God.* They worked on for three years, filling their pulpits by supplies from a distance, until at last, finding themselves able to engage the Rev. Jared Sparks as a minister, they sent to Boston to ask Dr Channing to come and deliver the ordination sermon.

Upon so new and unprecedented an event as this, the setting apart a minister to the work of teaching a doctrine that had hardly got for itself a name in America, Channing thought it incumbent upon him to make an open, candid, and plain statement of the principles the new building was raised to uphold. The task could not have fallen into better hands. The sermon, clear in its reasoning, simple in its language, and comprehensive in the truths it unfolds, was equal to the occasion; when printed, it appeared even more powerful and convincing than it had done from the pulpit. It was re-printed by thousands, both in England and America, and was widely read.

It was on his way home from this visit to Baltimore that Channing stayed a short time at New York, and while still warm with the zeal kindled in him by the courage and activity he had just been witness to, he preached a few times there to his friends gathered together in a private house. From these services sprang a religious society, which afterwards grew into a Unitarian Church in that city.

The movement in Baltimore which had so markedly called Channing forth into a more distinct expression of his opinions than he had ever made before, had further an effect upon the rest of the religious world in America, by drawing more sharply the line of demarcation between those of Unitarian opinions and the churches around them. It revealed to both parties the ground on which they stood. The sermon was attacked by the theological professors at Andover College, and defended by those at Cambridge. The whole religious community became interested and took a part with one side or other. And the Unitarians, as they now began to be called, were placed in the position of a distinct and separate sect.

"We ought not to ascribe to God that which we should hate in a man."—*Jeremy Taylor.*

"Not only to know, but to do according to thy knowledge, is thy vocation."—*Fichte.*

"When a man lives with God his voice shall be as sweet as the murmur of the brook and the rustle of the corn."—*Emerson; Self-reliance.*

"Of these doctrines" (reprobation and the damnation of unbaptised infants) "it is not too much to say, that in the form in which they have often been stated, they surpass in atrocity any tenets that have ever been admitted into any pagan creed, and would, if they formed an essential part of Christianity, amply justify the term 'pernicious superstition,' which Tacitus applied to the faith."—*Lecky; Hist. of Europ. Morals, v.* 1, *p.* 28.

Digitized by Google

RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES BELIEVED BY UNITARIANS.

No. 2.—THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

EVERY one who considers the workings of the material universe and the course of human experience, must acknowledge that there exists some power superior to that of man. The question is, shall we call this supreme power *him* or *it*, shall we think it is a person or only a fate or law? When we say we believe in the existence of God, we mean that we believe there is a PERSON who has caused and who governs all we see around us.

The essence of personality is the possession of will and intelligence. No difficulty is felt in ascribing these attributes to a being perceived by our senses, if his actions show that he puts forth voluntary effort guided by a perception of the ends to be answered by the means he employs. Even if our senses do not make us acquainted with his existence, if he has disappeared from the earth centuries ago, we believe in his being if we see marks of his intelligent activity. A traveller coming to a district now unpeopled, but finding there traces of dwellings, implements and cultivated lands, naturally concludes men once lived there. Is there any cause for confining this mode of reasoning to *material* beings? May not the same principle lead to the recognition of a *spiritual* person? The only reason against it is the determination to deny that there can be a being who has not bodily organisation, because, it is said, "we have no experience of any rational creature without a material form." The answer is:—1. That millions of human beings say they *have* such an experience, when they feel the influence on them of an unseen God. 2. That it is unfair to measure possibilities by our own limited experience. We may therefore enter on the examination of the question without being prejudiced with the notion that there can be no God because no human senses perceive Him.

I. All nations in all ages have believed in God. The supposed exceptions are so few, and are found among tribes with which our aquaintance is so slight, that we may say mankind as a whole have conceived the idea. This must arise from some peculiarity of human nature. Man feels his own weakness and ignorance, and wants some one, superior to himself, to depend on. The child trusts in his parent to teach and guide and protect him. The man, especially in times of anxiety, pain and sorrow, looks in vain for the support he needs among his fellow-men, and yet feels compelled to seek some support. Even the most sturdy self-dependence sometimes falters amidst the battle of life, and longs to find an overruling power which will not allow our efforts to be fruitless.—Not less inherent in our nature is the sense of awe in the presence of the infinite. This awe is produced, more or less, by everything that appears to us unbounded. The darkness of night, the starry heavens in their immensity, the untrodden forest, the rolling billows of the pathless ocean, these produce an impression on the mind and heart. It is not that we fear anything in connection with them, but that they thrill us with a solemn sense of the infinite. From this feeling of dependence, and this awe in the presence of Infinity, arises the belief in a Being on whom man may trust, who will take care of him and help him, and who is but dimly known, but partly understood, because his attributes are infinite. The seed of religion lies in every human soul ready to be called into vigorous growth by proper influences from without. Man instinctively believes in God without stopping to reason about Him. Both nations and individuals trust in and worship a Deity, long before they think of seeking any proof of his existence.

But it may be said that this intuitive, unreasoning acceptance of a doctrine is delusive, and that we ought not to believe anything till it is logically proved. Yet there are facts that no one doubts, that do not admit of such proof. You believe in your own existence, not because there is logical evidence of it, but because you feel it. The child believes in his mother's love, not because he has argued the matter, but because his heart teaches him concerning it. Our nature gives us a mind cap-

Digitized by Google

able of forming an idea of the Deity, and feelings fitted to receive and return his love, and impels us by its spiritual instincts to look up to Him. And this natural and instinctive belief, as it goes before all appeal to logic in point of time, is superior to all logic in power. The men who refuse to listen to such instincts on the subject, and will *only* reason about it, commit as great an error as those who are content merely to be led by feeling, and who denounce or ignore the use of reason in religion.

II. But while the belief in the existence of God arises naturally within us, it is confirmed by the reason. It is right and wise that we should enquire what the reason has to say about it, and if it is found to be unreasonable or self-contradictory or opposed to the deductions of observation and experience, the conclusion must follow that the spiritual instincts are mistaken. An appeal to argument must not make us forget that there is a teaching of consciousness on the subject, but it may be received as a valuable means of testing such teaching. The question is, Do human observation and experience show the presence of Will and Intelligence in the overruling power of the universe? To answer this, it is necessary to appeal to two laws of the human mind, which are generally acted on in the concerns of every-day life. These are, "that activity arises from will," and "that adaptation of means to an end is the mark of intelligence." We become acquainted with these laws in the first instance by self-consciousness. We know that when we raise a hand or walk a step it is a voluntary action; that if we go to church or walk in the fields on a Sunday, it is because we willed to do one instead of the other. Whenever we plan anything, arrange sticks for instance to kindle a fire, or sow seed that plants may grow, we are aware that it is by the exercise of thought that we see that the means employed is fitted to produce the result desired. Hence we deduce the conclusions, which cannot be denied by anyone, and which we are perpetually applying:—1. Wherever there is activity WILL is the origin of it. 2. Wherever means are adapted to produce a foreseen and intended result, there is INTELLIGENCE. Constantly do men act on these principles. If something is missing we say, "It can't have gone without hands," meaning some person, some being with a will must have been at work. If we leave a box locked up and find it opened, no one can persuade us that it has unlocked itself. If a question arise whether a certain criminal act is wilful or accidental, the evidence as to whether the means taken pointed to the result determines if there was malicious design. If sailors landing on an unknown coast find a well-contrived machine, they at once conclude that men have been there before them, and not mere savages, but men of intelligence. The two principles are fixed, certain and undeniable.

Apply then, these two principles to what we see and experience as to the workings of God in us and around us. In the material universe there is ceaseless activity. Plants grow, animals come into being, tides rise and fall, seasons change, planets revolve, from the smallest to the greatest parts there is constant movement. The source of this movement, the cause of this activity must be a WILL. But in every instance the means used are adapted to the result to be obtained. Every science, all study of nature, every moment of our lives shows proofs of this. They are so numerous and well known that it is impossible to enumerate them. The will that governs them is therefore guided by INTELLIGENCE. Thus the reason, applying the natural principles of the mind to the phenomena of the universe, confirms the belief in a personal God.

There are two main objections made to this reasoning:—1. That the "laws of nature" are sufficient to account for the universe without the belief in a God. 2. That there can be no Will at the root of the material activity we observe, because it is uniform. The latter of these objections I shall consider in the next article of this series, the former I shall now answer.

It is a favourite way of replying to questions as to the causes of phenomena, to refer them to natural laws. "Why does an apple fall to the ground?" "Because of the law of gravitation." But *law* only means a rule or plan according to which some force acts, it is not the force. "Why is a murderer hanged?" "Because of the law of England." But the law will not hang him, it is merely the rule by which judge, jailer and executioner act, the plan in accordance with which human wills are exerted. So the "laws of nature" are only the rules or plan by which certain

Digitized by Google

forces act. Gravitation means the rule that large masses of matter attract smaller ones, but the fact that it is so does not supply the power which causes the fact, and that power can only be supplied by Will. It is a great delusion to use the word "law" by which we mean the reason why we expect a certain effect, for the word "cause" by which we mean the force which brings about the effect whether we expect to see it or not.

There are some persons who, while they do not deny the existence of God, doubt if we can know anything about Him, and think it wiser to occupy themselves exclusively with material concerns. But it is evident that if there is a Being who has made and rules all things, it is desirable we should know all we can about Him, and that to listen to the conclusions of feeling and reason on this subject can in no way unfit us for earthly work. The great majority of mankind, including the wisest and the best, have believed on Him and have experienced benefit from such belief. Patient labourers at life's task who have found faith in God add worth and interest to the humblest employment. The genius of the artist has been displayed in its noblest form when it has been exercised with a consciousness that it is the gift of God. Philanthropists have toiled, martyrs have died, life-long sufferers have been supported, sages and prophets have taught, mourners have found comfort, one generation after another, in the belief in God. It is a bold thing to conclude hastily that all this has been superstition and error. It is an unwise thing to take for granted that *we* can know nothing about God when so many of the noblest of our race have declared that they knew Him, and that this knowledge was their greatest treasure.

For these reasons then Unitarians make the first article in their religious faith "the existence of God:"—1. It arises spontaneously in the human soul, founded on the natural feeling of dependence and sense of awe. 2. It is confirmed by reason from the evidences contained in the material universe of an active will guided by intelligence. 3. It is strengthened by experience, individual and general, and is found a comfort and blessing, accompanying all that is highest and most beautiful in human effort, affection, and achievement.

JOHN WRIGHT.

THE BOOK OF RUTH.

OUR readers are all familiar with the interesting history of Ruth, of her devotion to her mother-in-law, of her patient good conduct in poverty, and then of her marriage to a relation of her late husband, from which marriage King David was descended. Now, the writer of a biography has usually some moral purpose in view, which he does not always clearly point out to the reader, in which case we have to consider and find out for ourselves.

Had the life of Ruth been written when David was a young man, who had not yet had an opportunity of making his great qualities known, persecuted by King Saul, or even at a later time, when his power was weak and his throne tottering, we might suppose that some friendly writer had written the life of Ruth to show from what virtuous ancestors he was descended. But the Book of Ruth was not written at that time. All Biblical critics, including the Jewish critics, are agreed that it is one of the later books of the Bible, and that it was not written till four or five hundred years after David's death. At that time the great name of David could receive no further honour from such a history. He was the revered founder of a long line of kings. Hence we must look for another purpose as likely to have influenced the writer; and this we shall find in the circumstances of the time when it was written. The Jews, after their return from captivity, had many of them married foreign wives; and these wives both Ezra and Nehemiah had ordered them to put away. But this cruel command was not approved of by every body. The prophet Malachi very distinctly blames it, saying, that the putter away is hateful to Jehovah. And the writer of the Book of Ruth seems to have he'd the same opinion. He could confer very little additional honour upon King David by showing that he was descended from a virtuous great-grandmother. But, on the other hand, he could do something in defence of these foreign marriages by showing that the great King David himself was descended from a Moabite.

Digitized by Google

A Few of the LAWS Relating to RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS in ENGLAND, Arranged Chronologically.

DIRECTLY we come to the opening of the Reformation in England, the Acts of Parliament passed for the suppression of heresy and dissent form an important and instructive part of the history of these early times, while the gradual relaxing and repealing of these cruel and unjust laws, and the various steps made in acknowledgment of the rights of every man's conscience, and towards the establishment of a complete religious equality, is one of the most encouraging signs of improvement in later days. The bare enumeration of some of those statutes that may be collected together out of our ordinary books of history is enough to show this.

A.D.

1401. Act passed for burning heretics, 2 Hen. IV. c. 15. Wm. Sautree, clergyman, suffered under this act, probably the first case of burning for religion in England.

1408. A Decree passed that no unauthorised person shall translate the Bible. This is an endeavour to check the spirit of inquiry that Wickliffe's translation of the Scriptures from Latin into English has given rise to. A century later, in 1526, when Tyndale translated the New Testament from the original Greek, the prohibition seems to be still in force, and he is obliged to go to Antwerp in order to print it in safety.

1413. Act passed for burning Lollards as heretics, 2 Hen. V. c. 7. This law confirms and strengthens that passed in the last reign. It continues in force above 200 years, during which time we especially notice Lord Cobham burned for Lollardy shortly after it is passed. In Edward VI.'s reign Joan Bocher, a woman of distinction and education, and George Van Paris, surgeon; in Elizabeth's time, several Anabaptists, and under King James, Bartholomew Legate and Ed. Wightman were all burned to death under it.

A.D.

1534. The Pope's supremacy abolished in England and that of the King's established in its place by Henry VIII. In the following year Sir Thomas More is beheaded for refusing to take the oath of the King's supremacy.

1536. Henry VIII. publishes Ten Articles of religious belief.

1538. Parliament publishes the Statute of the Six Articles, 31 Hen. VIII. c. 14, being an act "for abolishing diversities of opinion," and sentencing all oppugners of the same to be burned as heretics. These Articles agree in doctrine with the Church of Rome.

1542. An Act passed to prohibit the reading of the Bible to all under the rank of gentlemen and gentlewomen.

1558. Queen Elizabeth comes to the throne. She narrows the terms of conformity, 1 Eliz. c. 2. Out of 9400 clergymen of England, only 177 decline to turn Protestant and resign their livings.

1562. A Committee of Divines revise King Edward's Liturgy, and publish the Book of Common Prayer and the 39 Articles in nearly their present form.

1572. Act passed, 13 Eliz. c. 12, requiring all clergymen to subscribe the 39 Articles.

1593. An Act passed, 35 Eliz. c. 1, requiring attendance of all persons upon the established worship of the Church. Numbers of dissenters fly to Holland. Barrow and Greenwood are put to death under this act.

To be continued.

UNITARIAN STATISTICS.

WE have no means of knowing the number of the worshippers in our Congregations at any time, and thus to learn how far they keep up with the increase of the population in the United Kingdom. That valuable publication, *The Unitarian Almanac*, does, however, tell us the number of our Ministers, and also the number of our places of worship, each year; and hence we learn something of our progress. This it will be safer to consider, not year by year, when accidental irregularities in the returns may lead to mistakes, but after a period of several years. We will compare the *Almanac* for the year 1865 with that for the present year; and we will classify our respected

Digitized by Google

Ministers according to their place of education. We thus obtain the following table:—

UNITARIAN CONGREGATIONS, WITH THEIR MINISTERS, FOR

	JAN. 1865.	JAN. 1872.
York and Manchester Colleges,	53	55
Home Missionary Board,	34	56
Belfast College, . .	39	35
Carmarthen College, .	22	19
Glasgow University, .	18	12
Dublin University, . .	5	3
Other Colleges, . .	27	30
Unknown, . . .	70	70
Total Number of Ministers,	268	280
Pulpits Vacant, . .	23	29
Do. with Supplies, .	41	47
Total Number of Unitarian Congregations, . .	332	356

These figures certainly show little or no increase above that arising from the national increase of population, which is about one *per cent. per annum.* The Ministers from *other colleges* are those who have joined us from the orthodox bodies. Manchester New College furnishes its usual number, which has been by no means lessened by the growth of the Home Missionary Board. The demand for Ministers is shown by the numbers Pulpits Vacant; which number is not likely to be diminished until Congregations raise their salaries. The activity of our Lay Preachers is shown by the number of small rooms kept open by Supplies. This is the number which we should especially try to enlarge, being very sure that in due time such small Congregations will grow into large Congregations, and move up into the rank of Chapels with Ministers.

The number of worshippers in these Congregations can only be stated according to each person's very limited means of observing. But as our Chapels have been sadly empty, we may reasonably suppose that, as they have had room for more numbers, and the Chapels have increased in number, there must have been at the same time some little filling up of the empty pews.

Our newspapers have often discussed the question of how our Ministers' salaries can be raised. These figures, taken together with the only safe answer to the enquiry, are rather encouraging on that head. Salaries are fixed by the known law of supply and demand. Every encouragement given to open rooms for prayer and preaching, by means of laymen, is a direct help towards obtaining a better remuneration for our Ministers. The lay-preacher is not the rival of the Minister; he does not stand in his way; but he creates a demand for him. During the last seven years the demand for Ministers has increased; and hence salaries must assuredly be raised.

QUESTIONS ON THE BIBLE.

1. Say what is the sting and point in every part of Stephen's speech, in Acts vii., which so exasperated his hearers that they stoned him to death for it.

2. In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians Paul says, that he had visited them once, and had intended a second visit (1. 15), and he gives his reasons why he had not come a second time as proposed. But he ends his epistle with saying that he is ready to come a third time (xii. 14.) Point out in the life of the apostle, as related in the Acts, the occasion on which he might have so written without any inconsistency.

3. In what places in the Old Testament is the Book of Jasher quoted?

4. In one of the additions to the Book of Jeremiah, chap xxxi. 22, we read, "The Lord hath created a new thing upon the earth, A woman shall compass, or come round, a man." On what important occasion was the Jewish nation benefitted by a woman overpersuading a man?

5. Where in the Bible do we read of angels with names?

6. What were the High Places, which are so often mentioned in the history with blame?

Digitized by Google

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

THIRD LESSON.

A VERB is said to have voices;—Active, Passive, and (in Greek) also Middle;—and to be in the Active Voice when it describes what sombody does, as *I say*,[16] *they went up*;[1] to be in the Passive Voice when it describes what is done to someone, as *having been placed*;[4] and to be in the Middle Voice when it is either like a French Reflected Verb, *I recollect myself*, as in the lesson below, *themselves to have prayed*;[2] or, like a Latin Deponent Verb, it has a Passive spelling, but with an Active meaning.

Also, in whichever Voice it may be, a Verb has Moods, just as a man may be in a talkative mood, a doubting mood, an imperative mood, or a pleasant mood. So a Verb is said to be in the INDICATIVE MOOD when it describes (indicates) or tells a history, as *I give thanks*,[6] *he was striking*,[14] and this is the commonest mood of all; To be in the SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD, when it is subjoined to, or dependent on, another verb, of which we will give examples in a future Lesson; To be in the OPTATIVE MOOD, when it expresses a wish; but this is very little used; To be in the IMPERATIVE MOOD, when it commands or entreats, as *Be thou merciful*;[15] To be in the INFINITIVE MOOD, when it has the word *to* before it, as *to have raised*;[13] Lastly, to be one of the PARTICIPLES, or in an Adjective Mood, when it ends in *ing*, as *humbling*,[20] *having stood*.[12]

Also, in whichever Voice and whatever Mood a Verb may be, it has Tenses or times,—The PRESENT; the IMPERFECT; the INDEFINITE, called Aorist, which is properly the historian's tense; the PERFECT, or completely past; the PLUPERFECT; and the FUTURE.

Also, every Tense has Numbers,—The SINGULAR; the PLURAL; and (in Greek) also the DUAL Number, which we noticed in the Article. But this is very little used.

And every Number has Three Persons.
I, Thou, He, in the Singular;
We, You, They, in the Plural;
We two, You two, They two, in the Dual.

Now, we will turn to the lesson below, and after reading it over, will notice in which Tense, Mood, and Voice each of the Verbs is that we meet with.

*** The figures refer to the number of the line in the Greek.

Luke xviii. 10—14.

1 Ανθρωποι δυο ανεβησαν εις το
Men two went up into the
2 ἱερον προσευξασθαι· ὁ εἷς
temple-yard themselves to have prayed; the one
3 Φαρισαιος, και ὁ ἑτερος τελωνης.
a Pharisee, and the other a tax-gatherer.
4 Ὁ Φαρισαιος, σταθεις προς ἑαυτον,
The Pharisee having been placed by himself,
5 ταυτα προσηυχετο· Ὁ θεος,
these [words] was himself praying; The God
6 ευχαριστω σοι, ὁτι ουκ ειμι ὡσπερ
I give thanks to thee, that not I am as
7 οἱ λοιποι των ανθρωπων, ἁρπαγες,
the rest of the men, graspers,
8 αδικοι, μοιχοι, η και ὡς οὑτος
unrighteous, adulterers, or even as this
9 ὁ τελωνης. Νηστευω δις του
the tax-gatherer. I fast twice of the
10 σαββατου, αποδεκατω παντα ὁσα
week, I pay tithe all [things] whatsoever
11 κτωμαι. Και ὁ τελωνης μακροθεν
I get. And the tax-gatherer afar off
12 ἑστως ουκ ηθελεν ουδε τους
having stood, not wished not even the
13 οφθαλμους εις τον ουρανον ἐπαραι·
eyes to the heaven to have raised;
14 αλλ' ετυπτεν εις το στηθος αὑτου,
but was striking on the breast of him,
15 λεγων· Ὁ θεος, ἱλασθητι μοι τῳ
saying; The God, be thou merciful to me the
16 ἁμαρτωλῳ. Λεγω ὑμιν, κατεβη οὑτος
sinner. I say to you, went down this one
17 δεδικαιωμενος εις τον οικον αὑτου,
having been justified to the house of him,
18 η γαρ εκεινος· ὁτι πας
rather than indeed that [man]; for every
19 ὁ ὑψων ἑαυτον, ταπεινωθησεται·
the [one] exalting himself, shall be humbled;
20 ὁ δε ταπεινων ἑαυτον,
the [man] And humbling himself,
21 ὑψωθησεται.
shall be exalted.

Digitized by Google

Now, we will pick out from our text, first, the Verbs that are in the Active Voice, and write against each which Mood it is in, and which Tense; and then do the same with those in the Middle Voice; and then with those in the Passive Voice.

ACTIVE VOICE.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Present Tense,

ευχαριστω,[6] αποδεκατω,[10] Λεγω.[16]
I give thanks, I pay tithe, I say.

Imperfect Tense, ετυπτεν.[14]
he was striking.

Aorist Tense,

ανεβησαν,[1] ηθελεν,[12] κατεβη.[16]
they went up, he wished, he went down.

IMPERATIVE MOOD.

Present Tense, ἱλασθητι.[15]
be thou merciful.

INFINITIVE MOOD.

Aorist Tense, επαραι.[13]
to have raised.

PARTICIPLES.

Present Tense,

λεγων,[15] ὑψων,[19] ταπεινων.[20]
saying, exalting, humbling.

Perfect Tense, ἑστως.[12]
having stood.

MIDDLE VOICE.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Present Tense, κτωμαι.[11]
I get.

Imperfect Tense, προσηυχετο.[5]
was himself praying.

INFINITIVE MOOD.

Aorist Tense, προσευξασθαι.[2]
themselves to have prayed.

PASSIVE VOICE.

INDICATIVE MOOD.

Future Tense,

ταπεινωθησεται,[19] ὑψωθησεται.[21]
he shall be humbled, he shall be exalted.

PARTICIPLES.

Perfect Tense, δεδικαιωμενος.[17]
having been justified.

Aorist Tense, σταθεις.[4]
having been placed.

On looking at these Verbs we see that there are often two and even three English words to one Greek Verb. For where in English we put a Pronoun before the Verb, as *he* or *we*, and sometimes a sign of the Mood, as *to* or *may*, and sometimes a sign of the Tense or time, as *shall* or *have*, in Greek the Verb alone shows all these changes of meaning by changing the last few letters of the Verb itself. And this is what is meant by a Verb being *declined.*

For example: notice that all the Verbs in the Active, Indicative, Present, 1st Person, end with a long ω, which may be said to be equivalent to the word *I;* and that in the Middle Voice the same 1st Person ends differently. Notice that the Active Present Participles all end in ων, where the English words end in *ing.* Also, that the Verbs in the Future of the Passive Voice both end with θησεται, equivalent to *shall be.*

Now, if our readers will match these few Verbs, by means of their final letters, against the pattern Verb in their Grammars, it will help to teach them to find for themselves another time the exact meaning of the Greek Verb they may want.

Next time we hope to speak more about the final letters or *Tense Endings.*

GEMS OF THOUGHT FROM DR CHAPIN.

It is one of the gravest mistakes in the world to be looking for great opportunities.

He who casts out and insults a mother's love has reached the last degree of depravity.

Christ's truth is the higher order of nature. It is the spiritual series of God's works which complete the great whole.

We reject Christ whenever we deny the dictates of his blessed teachings, and go counter to his high and holy life.

Mere compromising, covering up, is not peacemaking. The bold assertion of the right is peacemaking.

We pervert God's purpose when we turn a blessing, by the thought of its transiency, into a bitterness.

On this great battle-field of life, God sets the position, God arranges us, and puts us in our places. We may desert, we may run away, we may lie down; but the position is not of your chosing, but of God's.

Digitized by Google

OUR PURPOSE.

"CHRISTIANITY not the property of Critics and Scholars, but the Gift of God to all Men." This is the title of one of the Lectures given thirty-three years ago, in Liverpool, in defence of Unitarianism. We have frequently been struck with the truth of this statement. It is, however, one thing to say what is right, and another to set in operation the means for attaining such a desirable result, as the reception by all men of the gift of God. The Unitarian, in holding to the position that nothing is essential in simple Christianity which cannot be traced to those teachings of Jesus that are of general application, has an advantage over the advocate of the popular theology, who, in the first place, finds it necessary to insist upon men taking for granted the decisions of critics and scholars as to what Christianity is. The Unitarian takes his hearers at once to Jesus. The orthodox teacher first imposes restrictions upon the mind of his disciples, and then has the audacity to assert that, in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, for instance, Jesus does not include all the facts which relate to the reconciliation of man to God. Notwithstanding his superior advantages, the Unitarian has often stood too much on the defensive, and has been jealous of his reputation as a "scholar and a critic," and, accordingly, the very lecture to which we have referred is addressed substantially to "critics and scholars."

We do not deny that it is desirable for Unitarians to be competent to examine and refute error. But this has been done, over and over again. If any one wishes to test the truth of this remark, if he has access to a Unitarian Chapel Library, a glance through the volumes of the *Monthly Repository*, *The Christian Reformer*, *The Christian Teacher*, *&c.*, *&c.*, will reveal how completely the whole debateable ground has been gone over.

We may see the results in the content and calm which is discovered in Unitarian congregations throughout the country, untroubled by science or scepticism. Believing in the reality of religion, the power of prayer, and having the hope of immortality, Unitarians have entered into their rest. It is no doubt the case that those who are, for a long period, required to do almost everything in simple self-defence, find, when they are relieved from this necessity, that their "vocation is gone." They shrink from what seems to be an interference with the opinions of others. But how can any Unitarian, when he sees the working-classes, and the comparatively ignorant, so far as they receive any religious impressions,—are entirely at the mercy of those whose misfortune it is to be the instruments for perpetuating the audacious speculations of "critics and scholars." In the *Missionary* we invite the co-operation of our brother ministers, and other friends, to make it clear to the poorest and most unlearned, that it is a blessing to take Christianity alone from the lips of the Teacher, and to cast aside the catechisms and creeds which have grossly perverted the simple gospel of the Sermon on the Mount, and the Parable of the Prodigal Son. In fact, to do for the common people what hitherto has been done only for "critics and scholars."

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

THE TEACHER.

THE aim of the teacher who desires to faithfully use the opportunity that is afforded him in the Sunday School should be to plant in the minds of the children the seeds of a religious life. It is plain the teacher must himself be religious. We do not forget that there is in Sunday Schools a great deal of mere hard mechanical utterance of sounds, a reading of chapters from the Bible or other books—the teacher often being merely a detector

Digitized by Google

of mispronunciation or inattention. We shall not waste words in blaming this state of things,—our purpose is rather to bring home to the judgment of the teacher the knowledge that a serious responsibility rests upon him to settle in his own mind the important question, Am I doing all that I might do to influence the future lives of my scholars in the direction of piety? When the teacher feels the religous importance of his position, an impulse is given to his efforts, which the most indifferent of his scholars will feel and remember. Earnestness and enthusiasm are not out of place in one who needs to convince the young that religion is a reality.

Perhaps some teacher after reading our remarks may feel discouraged because he may never have regarded his relation to the children he has been led to teach as one of deep responsibility. But to such we would earnestly appeal, to henceforth make it a matter of principle, and to endeavour to do his part in the cause of righteousness. However, the duty of understanding the relation in which persons advanced in life sustain to the young does not alone concern Sunday School Teachers. In workshops, places of business, offices, where young persons are introduced to learn a trade, or to labour, very much depends upon the character of the men these youths are brought into contact with. We know that the dark side of this picture is black enough; and we fear that often a boy learns lessons in vice from those who ought to influence him for good. We do not hesitate to assert that every person who is brought into any sort of relationship with the young is under the most serious moral obligation to refrain from giving the least encouragement to anything that might degrade and debase the minds or hearts of those who depend so much upon the precept and example of their elders. At all events, let the Sunday School teacher and parent fully realise how much is entrusted to their charge, when young minds are before them to receive knowledge; and pure souls, in which may be deeply planted the seeds of morality and pure religion. We would recommend the reading of Dr Channing's discourse on the Sunday School to all Sunday School teachers.

NOTES ON JOHN I. 1—17.

JESUS so intensely realised in his own experience the Sonship of the human mind to the Divine mind, that he not only gained power to call that spirit of sonship up in other souls, but sent it as a sort of spiritual force or shock down through the ages. The intensity with which he realised it in his own life caused him to be called by his followers THE Son of the living God, the first-born of many brethren. His followers were mainly of two kinds: Jews and Græcised Jews; or, afterwards, Hebraised Greeks. The Jewish Christians, faithful to the genius of their race, dwelt more on the moral side of the Divine mind, and spoke of it, when regarded as acting on human souls, as *Holy Spirit*. The Gentile Christians, on the other hand, in whom the intellect was stronger than the moral nature, fixed their attention rather on the intellectual side of the Divine mind, and spoke of it when active in creation, or in human hearts, as the *Divine Word*.

When, therefore, they sought to express their sense of Jesus' Sonship to God as the source and secret of his spiritual richness and force, they phrased their teachings according to the bent of their genius. The Hebrew Christians spoke of him as having been flooded with the Holy Spirit at his baptism. Some, not content with this description, *dated back* his inspiration from his baptism to his birth, and said he was conceived by the Holy Spirit. Hence the legend of the miraculous birth from a virgin, perhaps originally not meant to be taken as *history*, but so taken by the blind ignorance of later days. Those Christians, on the other hand, who were influenced by Greek culture, said he was "The Divine Word" "made flesh," *i.e.*, that his inspiring influence was the Divine Creative Word.

Both the Hebrew "Holy Spirit" and the Greek "Divine Word" seem to me to mean one thing, viz., that side of Deity which can come into contact with humanity, and with creation generally. The Hebrew plainly means God himself when he

Digitized by Google

speaks of "Holy Spirit." The Greek seems, but only seems, to divide the Divine nature by expressing this *active side of Deity* as an "emanation" or "son." I do not see, therefore, why "it" should be given in the translation instead of "Him." In the mouth of a Græcised Jew the phrases "Word," "Logos," or "Only-begotten Son," are modes of distinguishing Deity acting on the universe from Deity resting, inactive, and apart therefrom. Thus he is called, in "The Epistle to the Hebrews," "a ray flung off from the Divine glory;" or "the impressed image of God's essence," where the simile is taken from the image impressed on a soft substance by a seal. The two methods of viewing the Divine action are combined in the phrase the "wisdom" of God, yea, the "power of God unto salvation." As we know, the "Church" passed into the hands of the Gentiles; the Jewish Christians were shut out as "Heretics;" and the Greek method of conceiving the inspiration of Jesus became "orthodoxy." Soon, however, the Hebraic method re-entered the Church, no longer recognised indeed as the equivalent of the Logos doctrine, but as its complement; and "God the Holy Ghost" became the third manifestation (person) of Deity. Thus the Trinitarian scheme was filled in, the Father the Substance, or, as we should now say, the Essence of Deity; and God coming in contact with creation in his two aspects of Mind *i.e.*, *intellectual* as *Word or Son;* and *moral* as "*Holy Ghost.*"

To Moderns, this is a very roundabout way of conceiving the simple fact that in Jesus was a Divine Sonship attained, and a power of calling forth that Divine Sonship in other souls, to which the world knows, or, at least, has not hitherto shewn a parallel. R. P.

MISSIONARY WORK.

LONDON.

The season is now come that is most favourable for lectures and evening meetings. The Conferences at Stamford Street have been continued on Fridays; and the subjects of everlasting punishment, and the import of the word "hell," have excited more than usual attention. The majority of the audience and of the speakers, who have to defend the *pro* and *con* of the subject alternately, are of the orthodox community. Some would-be speakers, who declined to take either side of the question, but who evidently were fond of talk, had to be requested to sit down, as it was clear that their arguments would lead nowhere; the whole object of these meetings being to grapple with, and not to evade difficulties. At Mile End, the Wednesday lectures were re-opened by a very able and interesting lecture, by the Rev. C. C. Cox, of Leicester, which, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather, was well attended; and at its close questions were proposed by both orthodox and secularists.

The London District Unitarian Society, at the request of some inhabitants, have turned their attention to the *West* of London, and commenced a course of Sunday Evening Services in the Victoria Hall, Archer Street, Notting Hill. It is a neatly decorated and commodious building; and large and attentive gatherings of worshippers have assembled, and some names have been given in by those willing to sustain a permanent cause in this quarter. The greatest difficulty here will be to find a minister who will combine with pulpit ability the necessary aptitude for the varied pastoral work which would be required to gather a permanent congregation.

At the last business meeting of the Lay-Preaching Union, one of the most active of their members (Mr G. Carter) was unanimously appointed Secretary On the 28th of February they hold a social meeting, when the subject of the best means of promoting the usefulness of the Union is to be considered. Much progress cannot be expected unless there be more zealous effort on the part of the laity. It is curious to see the metropolis placarded with immense bills, on which the word "Reform" appears conspicuous, as the banner under which the Church of England are beginning to agitate. It seems to a looker-on rather a cowardly hiding of truth than a *reform* in the right direction, to determine of the Athanasian Creed that it is valuable and important, but to introduce it to the public less frequently. It is a wholesome sign when any Church feels its need of reform.

MISSIONARY CONFERENCE.

The Annual Meeting of the above was held in the Memorial Hall, Manchester, on the 18th and 19th of January. Besides the individual efforts of members, the Conference has undertaken to promote a knowledge of Liberal Christianity by holding services at Blackpool and Scarborough,—towns which lie somewhat out of the field of operations of the Lancashire and Yorkshire Associations. Encouraging reports were given of the success at both the above places. It was resolved to continue these efforts, especially during the summer months, and if possible, to attempt a service at Harrogate. Next year a Public Missionary Meeting will be held in connection with the Conference, with the view of bringing the work of our Church before the people generally.

Digitized by Google

WEST BROMWICH.

Steps are being taken to build a Unitarian Chapel here immediately. The ground has been bought; and above £400 subscribed towards the cost.

PADIHAM, LANCASHIRE.

The first stone of the Unitarian Chapel is to be laid on Good Friday, March 29th.

SHEFFIELD.

"The Rev J. Lettis Short announces his intention to deliver a course of *brief* and *plain* Sunday evening lectures on Christian Doctrines, gathered by a Unitarian, from Jesus and his Apostles."

HASTINGS.

Here classes for beginners in Latin and French have been formed in addition to those for the Greek Testament. Probably in no chapel is the number of Greek students so large in proportion to the congregation as here.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

THE following Statement of Unitarian Doctrine, we understand, has been freely distributed in connection with a course of Doctrinal Lectures delivered by the Rev. Alfred Payne, in the Church of the Divine Unity, Newcastle, during the past winter: —

A STATEMENT OF UNITARIAN DOCTRINE.

N.B.—As much variety of opinion exists within the borders of the Unitarian Church, this statement must be taken as neither authoritative nor exhaustive, but only as expressive of the general views of those who issue it.

GOD.—We believe that He is absolutely ONE, in contradistinction to the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead: "The LORD our God is ONE Lord;" that He is the Creator, Ruler, Inspirer, Preserver, and Disposer of all things; that He is infinite in wisdom, power, and goodness; that He is "our Father who is in heaven," and is the only Object of our supreme worship, love, and obedience.

JESUS CHRIST.—We believe that Jesus Christ is what the Scriptures appear to us uniformly to declare Him to be, viz.: Son of God and Son of Man, our Lord and Master, the perfect Teacher and the perfect example, the Head of the Christian Church and the Saviour of the world from its sin. Accepting the declaration which he distinctly made when he said "My Father is greater than I," we yet believe that he so brightly manifested the divine character that he could also truly exclaim, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

THE HOLY SPIRIT.—We believe in the Holy Spirit, not as the third person in the Godhead, but as a heavenly influence proceeding from God to illumine, energize, and sanctify the souls of men. None, we think are wholly destitute of this celestial gift. It is freely offered to all, and in proportion as any one asks, receives and cherishes it, he is himself made a partaker "of the divine nature."

MAN.—We believe that Man is God's crowning and noblest terrestrial work, and that his nature is, therefore, not radically evil, but radically good; that he can transgress as well as obey the laws of heaven, and is very generally led, in a world of temptation, to abuse his moral powers, to wander from the path of duty, and to become greatly corrupted by sin, though never *totally* depraved: that he may be restored to holiness and peace, and that for this he needs the forgiving love and renewing grace of God.

REVELATION.—We believe that God reveals himself to men in Nature, in Holy Scriptures, in Providence, and in the individual heart and conscience; that the Bible is a wonderful disclosure of the character and will of the Almighty (which disclosure is most perfect in the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ), and is thus a rule of faith and practice sufficient for our salvation; that in spiritual things it is divinely inspired, while it claims no authority in matters of historic and scientific fact, or of general knowledge and incidental detail.

SALVATION.—We believe that Salvation consists in moral and spiritual integrity, not in escape from future punishment, that it is most surely and satisfactorily gained by repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;" that not the death of Christ alone, but all his words, deeds, labours, and sufferings are fitted to constrain us to penitence, love, purity, and obedience, and so to reconcile us to God: that a man's salvation is proved less by his assent to a creed, and his devotion to outward forms and professions, than by his personal righteousness, and by the possession of a christianlike spirit; that WE ARE SAVED SO FAR AS WE ARE SANCTIFIED.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.—We believe in the sacred origin of Christ's visible Church, which consists of all those of every sect who are partakers of his spirit; in the value of the rite of Baptism and of the sacrament of the Lord's supper; in the duty of private prayer and of public worship, and in the supreme importance and worth of that religion of love to God and love to man, which was proclaimed and illustrated in the teachings, life, character, and death of Jesus.

DEATH AND ETERNITY.—We believe that Death is not Destruction, but the passage of the soul from the mortal to the immortal life; that in that immortal life virtue will be rewarded and vice punished; that future punishment will have the same purpose as present affliction, viz, the deliverance of the soul from the bondage of sin; and that all men will be finally brought into union with God, and be saved everlastingly, so that

"Not one life shall be destroyed,
Or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete."
Tennyson.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.—The monthly meeting of the Committee was held on the 13th inst., R. A. Marsden, Esq., in the chair. The Finance Committee recommended the sale of £500 of the Association stock, to meet the current expenditure, which is above the income. This was agreed to. The missionary reports from various parts of the country were presented to the Committee, and votes amounting to 10,615 books and tracts, to twelve different places, were made. The Secretary reported the sale of 500 volumes of the cheap edition of Chan-

Digitized by Google

ning's Works, and that 1,250 volumes of Dr Vance Smith's "The Bible and Popular Theology" (third edition) had been printed, and are now ready. A few appeals for small sums to aid missionary efforts were responded to. The Secretary reported the receipt of a large number of country papers that had favourably reviewed Priestley's "Corruptions of Christianity," and would prepare a digest of the same for a future meeting. A letter was read from Mr Henry Sharpe, jun., calling attention to the fact that, at the Convocation of Canterbury, on the 9th of February, the Archbishop of Canterbury, speaking of the Athanasian Creed, said, "With regard to the damnatory clauses, there was no person in that room who believed in them." The Committee were informed that among our churches over the whole country courses of doctrinal lectures were being delivered, and that their grants of books and tracts were doing a signal service.—*Inquirer.*

Ossett Iron Church Anniversary.—The Anniversary Meeting of the congregation assembled in this place, which is one of the Band of Faith Missions founded by the Rev. Goodwyn Barmby in our neighbourhood, was held on Shrove Tuesday. The attendance was more numerous than on the last annual occasion. After tea the Rev. Goodwyn Barmby took the chair, and reviewed the missionary work of the district. At Ossett, they had continued success during the year. At Barnsley, they were about removing into a new sanctuary, in a better portion of the town. At Castleford, a course of lectures had recently been given in the Co-operative Hall. The publication of their Monthly Messenger, which had commenced with the present year, had already been very useful. The Band of Faith had generally increased in number of members, in contributions to its Sustentation Fund, and in the development of its organization.—The Rev. T. R. Elliott, of Leeds, congratulated the meeting upon the general progress of their society, but had they also personally grown in faith during the past year? Did they more intensely feel that faith, that unlimited trust in God and in the success of every good object, and in the ultimate prevalence of truth, which the Band of Faith propounded? People of all religions might gain the heaven hereafter, but that faith would alone realise heaven here.—Mr William Whitworth, of Newton Moor, enumerated with thankfulness the more recent discoveries of science. But even when science had done more than it had hitherto accomplished, there were problems, which from their very nature it could not touch, and these belonged to the province of faith. There was needed therefore this brotherhood of faith, which Mr Barmby had founded, and all devout minds, though they might not even know of its existing form, were really entering into its spirit.—*Wakefield Free Press.*

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASSES.

The congregations in which the Greek Testament is taught are Stamford Street, Clerkenwell, Aberdeen, Stockton-on-Tees, Mile End, Islington, Walsall, Hastings, and Tenterden. We shall be glad to be told of any others that we may not have heard of.

REVIEWS.

The Gift of Life: A Book for the Young. Intended to present to their minds some of the Beneficent Purposes of God in Creation. By Sara Wood. Published by the Sunday School Association, 178 Strand, London.

We cannot better describe this very interesting work than in the words of the Preface:—

"This little book is intended to assist parents and teachers in giving to their children a conception of God as the Giver of Life.

It seems to the writer that we should not limit ourselves to presenting to the young ideas only of God in heaven—afar off, and away from them—nor only revealed to one people in distant times, but should also seek to represent him as near them *here*, and with them *now* giving and sustaining life, bestowing all the wonderful powers of his creatures, enriching their lives with all that is useful, good, and beautiful, and filling each day and hour with countless blessings and joys."

We heartily recommend The Gift of Life both to Sunday School teachers and parents. The price is 1s. 6d.

Philips' Scripture Atlas: Also published by the Sunday School Association: Contains Twelve Maps illustrating the Geography of the Bible.

We should like to see a map of the Roman Empire included, although we believe it is not usual to give a representation of the world in the time of Jesus in what is termed a Bible Atlas. The map of the Travels of the Apostle only partially meets the want.

The Band of Faith Messenger: Edited by the Rev. Goodwyn Barmby.

We have received the 1st and 2d numbers of the above.

The Trinity No Scripture Doctrine (as shown by Trinitarian Writers): Being a Series of Letters which appeared in the *Northern Whig* and *Belfast News-Letter*, in Reply to an Advertisement by a Unitarian Layman, offering a Reward of Five Pounds for a Text of Scripture, Stating the Trinity in accordance with "Creeds and Confessions," with full Replies to same: By a Unitarian Layman.

This pamphlet is fully described above. It will be found to contain information on the interpretation of Scripture passages. We believe the Unitarian Layman still holds his £5.

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

No. 4. APRIL 1872. PRICE 1D.

ORTHODOX DOCTRINES DENIED BY UNITARIANS.

By the Rev. JOHN WRIGHT, B.A., Bury.

No. 2.—THE TRINITY.

THE belief in the Trinity is held by a great majority of the Christian world. The following are orthodox statements of the doctrine:—

"We worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal."—*Athanasian Creed.*

"In unity of this Godhead, there be three Persons of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."—*First Article of the Church of England.*

"In the Unity of the Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost."—*Westminster Confession of Faith.*

This is a doctrine which it is utterly impossible to reconcile with reason. All Christians profess to believe in the Unity of God, a doctrine so plainly taught all through the Bible, that no one who takes the Bible as an authority can doubt it. The Trinitarian declares he believes God is *One* as much as the Unitarian. But then we ask how can God at the same time be three? The "persons" of the Trinity are spoken of separately, prayer is addressed to one apart from another, one is a Father, and another a Son, and another is said to proceed from the Father and the Son, how then can all *three* be *one?* If the doctrine of the Divine unity, as taught by the Hebrew prophets, and confirmed by Jesus Christ, be true, "The Lord our God is one Lord"—how can there be included in this unity three separate persons? The doctrine is opposed to the simplest rules of arithmetic and the plainest teachings of common sense.

But orthodox teachers reply that religion is above reason, and that we must believe what we cannot understand; that there are mysteries which call for the exercise of faith, and this is one of them. I grant that there are truths which are above the human understanding, that the mind of man cannot for instance grasp the full conception of the Infinity or the Omnipresence of God, but may nevertheless believe in these attributes. But it is impossible for us to believe what is not above our reason but contrary to it, what is not a mystery—that is, a secret—but an absurdity, because a self-contradiction. Try, in the affairs of ordinary life, to persuade any one that three is the same as one, that the greater is equal to the less, and you will find it impossible. Ought these words then to be used in religion as synonom-

Digitized by Google

ous? It is sometimes replied that the "three" are not separate *beings*, but modes, distinctions, or manifestations. If this is all, why is prayer offered to each, do we pray to a mode or a distinction, or call on a manifestation to help us, apart from the Being manifested? Such philosophical subtleties, while they aim at clearing away the difficulties felt by the reason, abandon the Trinity altogether. This is not the plain meaning of the passages I have quoted from orthodox creeds, and those who cannot support that meaning should candidly acknowledge that they reject the creed. He who believes that creed (as Lord Bacon says) "believes things his reason cannot comprehend;—believes three to be one and one to be three; a father not to be elder than his son; a son to be equal with his father, and one proceeding from both to be equal with both; he believes in three persons in one nature, and two natures in one person."—*Works, Vol. II. p.* 410.

The only reply that is made to such representations as these, by Trinitarians, is that the doctrine of the Trinity is taught in the Bible, and that however impossible it may be to understand it or to reconcile it with human reason, it must be received on the authority of Scripture. Let us enquire then if the Bible does teach it. We must have some very plain and certain proof on this point to convince us of the truth of a doctrine that is incomprehensible and self-contradictory. The word Trinity is not found in the Bible. Jesus Christ approves of and confirms the Hebrew teaching "the Lord our God is one Lord," (*Mark xii.* 29), and never hints that there is any division of persons in the Godhead. Paul preached many discourses to both Jews and Gentiles, and wrote many letters to his converts, yet he never teaches this, now said to be the fundamental doctrine of Christianity. It cannot be expressed in the words of Scripture. Not one single text can be quoted in which its truth is asserted. No unprejudiced reader, who had never heard of the Trinity, would learn anything about it from the Bible.

Let us examine the passages of Scripture on which the believers in the Trinity depend for its support.

Gen. i. 26, "Let *us* make man in *our* image." The fact that the pronouns are plural, and that the Hebrew name for God has a plural ending, is said to prove that there are a plurality of persons in the Godhead. But this would equally well serve to prove that there are many Gods, if it proved anything. The fact is however, as many orthodox learned men have acknowledged, that the plural is used simply by way of dignity, just as a monarch in our own times commences a proclamation with *we* instead of *I*, and says "given at *our* palace." The Hebrews themselves, who are the best judges of their own language, universally give this explanation, and none of them ever dream of any doctrine at variance with the Divine Unity being taught in this text.

Matt. xxviii. 19, "baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Observe nothing is said here of the three persons mentioned together forming one God. To "baptise in the name" is equivalent to baptising in the belief, and this text signifies that those who were received as Christian converts were to declare their belief in God, in Christ and in the Holy Spirit; but not that the three are one. We have a similar expression, *I. Cor. x.* 2, "baptised unto Moses," but no one concludes thence that Moses was God. So *(Romans vi.* 3*)*, the disciples of Christ are said to be baptised into his death, that is into a profession of their belief of his death. We do not find in the Acts of the Apostles that the first Christian preachers used the formula given by Matthew, but they simply baptised into the name of Christ. Would they have failed to use the threefold formula if it had been significant of an important doctrine? Compare these words with the declarations of the doctrine contained in modern creeds, and it will be seen how the one fails to confirm the other.

II. Cor. xiii. 14, "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all."

Here again three are mentioned, but it is neither said nor hinted that they are one, or that they are God. On the contrary God is spoken of apart from the other two, which could not be the case, if they also were God. It will hardly be asserted that the mention of another in the same sentence with God proves that this other is God. We read *Ex. xiv.* 31, "the people feared the Lord and believed the Lord and his servant Moses." *I. Sam. xii.*

Digitized by Google

18, "the people feared the Lord and Samuel." *I. Chron. xxix.* 20, "worshipped the Lord and the king." Unless these texts prove that Moses, Samuel, and David were one with Jehovah, the texts we are considering cannot prove Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit to be one with God.

I. John v. 7, has often been quoted in support of the Trinity, but it is now generally acknowledged that this verse is an interpolation, and ought not to appear in the Bible. It is contained in no Greek manuscript written before the 15th century, in no Latin manuscript before the 9th century, in no ancient version. It was omitted by Zuinglius, Luther and Griesbach, and in the old English Bibles was printed in smaller type or between brackets. Its spuriousness has been admitted by learned Trinitarians of all denominations.

It has been shown (1) that the doctrine of the Trinity is self-contradictory and unreasonable; (2) that it is not taught plainly and explicitly in the Bible; (3) that it is opposed to the declarations of Christ and his apostles; (4) that the texts quoted in support of it do not express it. Why then should we receive it? Has it any important practical influence? Does it tend to make men pious and virtuous? Can it be expressed in Scripture language? Can it be put in any form that will reconcile it with common sense or recommend it to the human understanding? Let Christians ponder these questions, and if they find themselves compelled to answer "no" to them, let no power of fashion or custom or prejudice, no sanction of antiquity or Church authority induce them to profess a belief in a doctrine they can neither understand nor defend.

ON THE AGE OF THE BOOK OF JOB.

THE opinions of Commentators have differed widely as to when this most interesting Hebrew poem was written. It used to be thought one of the oldest books in the Bible, but that opinion is now held by few. Latterly some of our best critics have thought that it was written towards the end of the Jewish Monarchy, shortly before the heads of the nation were carried captive to Babylon. But the object of the present paper is to give reasons for thinking it yet more modern, and to show that it was probably written after the return from captivity, that is to say, about a hundred years after the Monarchy had ceased. The inquiry is of considerable importance, as no book can be thoroughly understood without knowing the circumstances in the midst of which the writer lived.

The first of these opinions is easily disposed of. It was only founded upon the simple patriarchal manners of Job and his friends, so like those of Abraham, as described in the Book of Genesis. But such manners convey no date, because they are to be found among the Arabs in the neighbourhood of Judea even at the present day. They are peculiar to the place, and not to any one time. And, moreover, the marks of civilisation with which the poem abounds prove it certainly far from being very ancient.

The proof of the modern date of the Book of Job rests upon the civilised arts mentioned; the quotations from other books of the Bible; and the political, philosophical, and religious opinions.

First, the writer mentions gold of Ophir, silver, iron, copper, and the art of mining (xxviii. 1-11); writing, and sculptured writing on stones (xix. 23); the sapphire stone had gained its present name (xxviii. 6); land-marks were used to divide estates (xxiv. 2); wheat and barley were cultivated (xxxi. 40); oil and wine were made (xxiv. 11); fields were ploughed and harrowed (xxxix. 10); cattle were pledged for debt (xxiv. 3); swift carriers and ships were in use (ix. 25); kings and judges and priestly rulers are mentioned (xii. 17-19); it was the custom for an accusation to be made in writing (xxxi. 35); mirrors were of polished metal (xxxvii. 18); music was produced by harps and pipes (xxx. 31); and in war by trumpets (xxxix. 24); soldiers carried shields made with bosses (xv. 26); and, when their ranks were closed, held them lapping one over the other like the scales of the crocodile (xli. 15); many of the constellations had received names,

Digitized by Google

and the zodiac was divided into parts, called, as by the Alexandrian astrologers, the chambers of the planets (ix. 9, and xxxvii. 9.)

For the writer's knowledge of the other Hebrew books we may note that he refers to Genesis iii. 8 when he says (xxxi. 33)

If I had covered my transgressions as Adam did.

When in chap. xxvi. 12 he says of God

He stilleth the sea with his power,
And by his understanding he smote the boaster,
By his spirit he garnished the heavens,
And his hand pierceth the cowardly serpent,

he shows acquaintance with Psalm lxxxix., and with Isaiah xxvii.

He borrows from the Introduction to the Book of Proverbs when he says, in chap. v. 17, and xxviii. 28,

Despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty,
Behold the fear of Jehovah that is Wisdom,
And to depart from evil is Understanding.

He makes use of words which we find in Hosea x. 12, 13, when he says, chap. iv. 8,

But as I have seen, they that plow iniquity,
And they that sow trouble, reap the same.

He borrows words from Isaiah, chap. xxxv. 3, written during the captivity, when in chap. iv. 3, 4, he says,

Behold thou hast instructed many,
And thou hast strengthened the weak hands;
Thy words have upholden him that was stumbling
And thou hast confirmed the feeble knees.

He shows that he had read Isaiah, chap. xli. 20, written on the return from captivity, when in chap. xii. 9 he says,

Who among all these knoweth not
That the hand of Jehovah hath done this?

And again, when in chap. iv. 18 he says

Behold, he putteth no trust in his servants,
And his messengers he chargeth with folly;

he is clearly referring to the words of the same writer, who, in chap. xlii. 19, had said "Who is so blind as my servant, or so deaf as my messenger, whom I am sending?"

Now, of the writings here quoted, the chapters of Isaiah were certainly written after the fall of the Monarchy. To the Introduction to the Book of Proverbs it would be difficult to give an exact date; but its personification of Wisdom as one present with God at the time of the Creation goes far to prove that it was not written till after the captivity. That the writer of Job should have had all these books before him almost fixes his book to the time of Ezra, who collected them to form a library. His introducing Satan among the angels shows acquaintance with some Eastern opinions which were not known to the Jews till they had dwelt as captives at Babylon. His use of the word "messenger" for a religious teacher, in c. xxxiii. 23, also brings the book down towards the time of Hagai and Malachi; while his calling this teacher an Interpreter shows that the Hebrew language, in which the Law was written, had already so far gone out of common use that it was necessary, as in the time of Ezra, to translate its commands into the Syriac or Aramaic spoken by the people.

In answer to this evidence that the Book of Job was probably written as late as the time of Zerubbabel, or even of Ezra, there is only one slight objection, which, however, must not be overlooked. Ezekiel, who wrote at the very beginning of the captivity, speaks of Noah, Daniel, and Job as three persons noted for their piety and well known to his readers. Does this prove that Ezekiel had read or known of the Book of Job? This question is best answered by asking another: Do these words prove that Ezekiel had known of the Book of Daniel? Now, all sound critics acknowledge that no part of the Book of Daniel was written till four hundred years after the Book of Ezekiel, and therefore, so far as Ezekiel's words are concerned, we are at full liberty to consider that the Book of Job was written perhaps one hundred years after the time of Ezekiel. Daniel and Job may equally have been persons well known to Hebrew literature long before the time when the books now bearing their names were written.

S. S.

HAMPSTEAD.—This congregation, though using the simple form of worship in the morning, have hitherto used a liturgy with a choral service in the evening. But now they have put aside the liturgy in the evening, and the service at that time is conducted with the same simplicity as in the morning.

The kingdom of heaven comes with every truth, no matter in what quarter it appears.

We are like Pilate, whenever we put aside honest convictions and the dictates of rectitude from a weak fear of popular clamour, or of any thing else.

Digitized by Google

THE ARGUMENTS FROM THE SCRIPTURES USED BY THE ANCIENT UNITARIANS.

THE nature of controversy changes like everything else as the centuries move on. Not only do the religious questions that filled men's minds in one age pass out of sight in a following generation, but methods of arguing are changed, new positions of defence and attack are taken up, fresh standing ground is chosen. The weapons formerly used with confident assurance, the solutions of difficulties that were once thought perfectly satisfactory, are now found to have a flaw in them, and are superseded by new ones. Yet, with all this, there is so much that is immortal and unchangeable in human nature, we, the Unitarians of to-day, have so many feelings in common with those who have gone before us in the great work of making a protest against the errors of orthodoxy, that it can never be useless or quite uninteresting to us to go back to early times and review the arguments of the early Christian writers upon any one branch of this subject, and to compare them with those that we now find by experience to be most convincing in our missionary work among the orthodox of our present day.

The following passages, gathered together by the industry of Dr Priestley, give opportunity for making such a comparison.

The great strong-hold of the Unitarians of early days was the Scriptures, and these taken in their plain literal sense. Basil, who was bishop of the church of Cæsarea in A.D. 370, writes concerning those around him, "They bawl out with their proofs from Scripture, and make no account of the unwritten traditions of the Fathers." And on another occasion Photinus, one of the learned of these Unitarians, boasted, in his dispute with Basil, that "he could prove his doctrine by a hundred passages from Scripture."

The orthodox, we must remember, were not in those days as they are now, the great mass of the people, nor were they for a length of time the majority among the bishops and clergy; but only by degrees and with difficulty they brought in their new Trinitarian scheme of theology, and established it as the doctrine of the Church. The tide of men's opinions was all against them during these first centuries, and we find them complaining of the unfair advantage which the Unitarians had over them in appealing to the literal sense of the Bible; and they asserted that "a Christian is not the disciple of the letter but of the Spirit, for *the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.*"

It was a general complaint that the Unitarians interpreted the Old Testament as the Jews did, and proved the doctrine of the Unity of God from it. Numbers of these writers quote the text from Deut., chapter vi. 4—"Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." And Marcellus, writing about A.D. 314, quotes from Isaiah xliv. 6 the words, "I am the first and I am the last, and beside me there is no God," and argues "there is, therefore, no younger God, nor any other besides the God who is the last, able to co-operate with God." Theodotus, in about A.D. 200, quotes the passage from Deuteronomy, applied to Christ in the Book of Acts—"A prophet shall the Lord thy God raise up unto thee, of thy brethren like unto me," as proving that Christ, who was to be like Moses, could not be God.

From the New Testament the Unitarians of those days brought forward many of the very same passages we now use to uphold the Unity of God. Thus, Marcellus, who was Bishop of Ancyra, in A.D. 314, a learned man, and stoutly opposed to the new doctrine of the Trinity, argued from Mark xii. 32, "There is one God, and there is none other but He." Others produced the well-known passages showing that Christ was called a "servant," and was "sent of God." They explained the phrase, "I and my Father are one," as meaning one by consent and harmony, not by nature, since Christ himself soon afterwards prays that he and his disciples may be one, as they two were one. See John xvii. 22.

Theodotus, whom we know as having

Digitized by Google

been excommunicated for his Unitarian opinions, in A.D. 200, and who was probably the first who was so treated, urged that Jesus spoke of himself as a man,—John viii. 40—"Ye seek to kill me, a MAN who told you the truth," and showed that in Acts ii. 22, Peter calls Christ "a man approved of God." The celebrated Augustine, Bishop of Hippo in Africa, in 395, says the Sabellians (a sect of Unitarians in his time), used the text, John vii., "My doctrine is not mine," as proving that Jesus derived everything from God. And Basil, whose controversial discussions with the Unitarians we have seen before, tells us that his opponents quoted against him John vi. 57, "I live by the Father."

In Colossians i. 15 Christ is called "the first-born of every creature." On this passage Marcellus says, "How could he who existed always, be the first-born of anything?" Cyril, of Alexandria, who was on the Trinitarian side, says of the Unitarians, about A.D. 412, "They continually urge the more simple among the people with the word *first-born*." Marcellus brought forward as decisive texts in proof of the unity of God, and the humanity of Christ, Ephesians iv. 5-6, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all," and 1 Tim. ii. 5, "There is one God and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

It is very curious to us to observe that the text, Philip. ii. 6, which, in the Authorised Version, is erroneously translated—"Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal to God," which is so often brought forward by the Trinitarians of to-day to support their arguments, was thought by the ancient Unitarians, who read it in the original Greek, to be favourable to their side of the question. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, about A.D. 367, blames them that they understood it to mean "that Christ would not by robbery make himself equal to God." Chrysostome, about A.D. 400, says that the Arians proved that Christ was not God from this text, for they said that Christ being in the form of God did not seize upon an equality with God.

Thus there were always some who endeavoured to read the Bible in the sense in which it was written, and used upon it the powers of reason and common sense that had been given them; and though the world disregarded them and followed its own path, the example of these old supporters of the plain and rational truth is a help and an encouragement to us who try to carry forward what they have begun.

The quotations from the early Christian writers, given above, are from a work of Dr Priestley's which is not sufficiently procurable among us—The History of the Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ; but we look forward to seeing it cheaply re-printed by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, as a companion volume to the History of the Corruptions of Christianity they have lately supplied us with.

A Few of the LAWS Relating to RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS in ENGLAND, Arranged Chronologically.

Continued from last month.

A.D.

1640. An order is passed that none should sit in Parliament without first taking the Sacrament according to the Church of England. A canon published prohibiting the importation and sale of Socinian books in England.

1641. The Court of the Star Chamber abolished by Act of Parliament, 16 Car. I. c. 10. This court had made itself justly odious by its cruel oppressions, having usurped the power of inflicting fines, imprisonments, and corporal punishments without the intervention of any jury, and was now done away with "to the general joy of the whole nation."

1646. Paul Best is prosecuted for denying the Trinity. His explanation is accepted, but an ordinance for punishing blasphemies and heresies as capital offences is brought in, and is passed into law two years after.

1652. The Sheriffs of London are directed to seize and burn all copies of Socinus's Racovian Catechism.

Digitized by Google

A. D.

1661. The Corporation Act, 13 Car. II. st. 2, c. 1, is passed. By this act no person can be elected to any city office without receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England. An Act against the Quakers passed.

1662. The Act of Uniformity, 14 Car. II. is passed. In consequence of this act 2000 clergymen of the Church of England left their pulpits and their livings on Aug. 24, Bartholmew's Day.

1663. The Conventicle Act, forbidding dissenters to meet for public worship, is passed.

1665. The Five Mile Act is passed, prohibiting any clergyman who had been ejected by the Act of Uniformity three years before from living within five miles of the church in which he had lately officiated. By this act numbers of those who had just been deprived of their incomes were cruelly forced to leave their homes, and the neighbourhood in which they might have found some means of maintaining themselves.

1670. The Conventicle Act, after being relaxed, is renewed, 22 Car. c. 1. This and the Five Mile Act were repealed in 1812 by the New Toleration Act.

1672. An indulgence granted to dissenters.

A. D.

1673. The Test Act, 25 Car. II. c. 2, is passed. By this act all officers, civil and military, are required to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, to make the declaration against transubstantiation, and to receive the Lord's Supper, under pain of disability to hold office, and a fine of £500.

1676. The writ for burning heretics abolished, 29 Car. II. c. 9. This act had fallen into disuse for above fifty years before it was anulled. Legate and Wightman in 1614 were the last who were thus barbarously burned for their religious opinions. Both were Unitarians.

1678. The New Test Act passed, disabling Roman Catholics from sitting in Parliament.

1680. Agitations made to bring in the Exclusion Bill, an attempt to exclude James II. from the throne, which however failed.

1686. Dissenters are allowed to purchase dispensations from prosecution.

1687. James II. publishes a Declaration for liberty of conscience to all his subjects. The English meeting houses begin to be built.

1688. James repeats his Declaration of Indulgence, and orders the clergy to read it from their pulpits. The English Revolution.

UNITARIAN BOOKSTALLS.

A Shop-keeper always sets forth in his window such goods as he thinks will find the most ready sale, and bring him the best profit. He cannot afford to lay in a stock of goods that will not easily sell. A bookseller likes best the most popular authors, works of fiction, school-books, books for children, and religious works of the popular theology. Whatever his own religious opinions may be, he can hardly venture to deal in Unitarian works, since the demand for them must necessarily be small, in consequence of the smallness of the Unitarian sect. The shop-keeper is the middle man between the producer and the public —in the case of books, between the author and the reader. And hence the difficulty with our Unitarian literature, which difficulty each congregation should endeavour to remove for itself. In every Unitarian congregation the chapel-keeper, or some one of the members, might be appointed bookseller for the body, and authorised to buy and keep on sale, not only our Unitarian periodicals, as is already done in many of our chapels, but also a small number of our Unitarian works. These should be selected, not simply on the principle that they are the works most likely to be bought, but also, to some extent, because the congregation think that they are those which ought to be bought, as being most likely to contribute to the spread of religious truth. In this way only can the difficulty which stops the sale of Unitarian books be removed. They are necessarily unpopular with the multitude, and therefore unpopular with the booksellers. The authors publish them without hope of profit, and often with the certain prospect of a loss. But even in this way they can hardly get into circulation, unless they are helped by the zeal of those who have a desire to make Unitarianism better known. If a book-stall were opened in the vestry or schoolroom belonging to our chapels, it would do much to spread a true theology. We should be glad to be told of any congregations that have tried this plan, and of the success that has attended it.

Digitized by Google

A REJOINDER to a REPLY, being a Portion of a Discourse.

Matt. xxv. 40.

"He (Jesus) proceeds to assign conduct towards himself as the reason, the sole reason, for the blessedness to be awarded to one portion of the entire human race, and the condemnation to be awarded to the other. Does such language befit any other lips than those of the Creator and Lord of all?"—*The Deity of Jesus Christ*, a Discourse by the Rev. Joshua Priestley, Wesleyan Minister, in reply to a course of lectures attacking the doctrine it maintains, by the Rev. William Mitchell, p. 6.

Let us examine this statement and see what it all amounts to. This is a parable, bear in mind.

1. What is a parable? It is not history, but a principle illustrated by a fictitious narrative that the principle may be the better understood. A parable is a principle dramatised; a sentiment embodied in suppositious circumstances, and set to act. It is in fact a prose-poem when rightly managed. It is not a literal representation of any transaction whatever, either past, present, or to come, but a showing of one thing by another, a teaching by examples chosen for the purpose of showing how a principle will act, or how it ought to act. Mr Priestley, then, makes a mistake to begin with in treating the parable as a literal transaction.

2. But suppose we take the story literally, and interpret it by the well-known conceptions respecting the Messiah held by the first generation of Christians and the contemporary Jews, we shall find that Jesus spoke as the head and the representative of humanity, which was believed to be one of the functions of his office. And if we go to the parable we find that it is not conduct towards himself that is ever once referred to, but conduct towards others, "Inasmuch as ye did *it to one of the least of these my brethren*, ye did it to me." Observe again, that the righteous evidently knew nothing of Jesus personally; they were astonished when he addressed them in the words he did. They were ignorant of having had any previous transactions with him of any kind. But he proceeds to tell them that any kindness shown to others, any help they had given to any son of need, he looked upon with the same feelings as if it had been done to him personally. Even if they had never heard of him before, and knew nothing of him as an individual, it was all the same, they had been working in the same great cause in which he was engaged—of rescuing the human race from sin and suffering.

Now, what is the evident deduction from all this? As it seems to me, this: That Jesus looked upon all right doing as Christian righteousness; and that if we want to get outside of the circle of his all-embracing truth and goodness, we shall have to fall into wrong doing, and to pursue evil as our good. On the same grounds some of the Fathers of the early Church claimed all good heathen men as Christians. This was notably the case with Origin and Justin Martyr. Socrates, Plato, Cleanthes, and Plotinus, and a host of others, were set down as Christians by them, because they were virtuous and pious men. So that the pure hearted, the sincere and noble-minded, who love God, and love man, and work righteousness; those who live up to their light, though they make no profession of "trusting in Christ," will be accepted by him as his fellow-workers in the world, for the "righteousness of God." It is enough to be good, to do good, to be one with him in spirit, character, and life, and so belong to him. "Visiting the sick, feeding the hungry, and going to those in prison," were specially eastern and early virtues, where and when the poor were so utterly neglected, and the tyrant rulers ever kept their dungeons filled with victims of their wrath and jealousy. But the meaning, as I understand it, is one for all time; that mutual sympathy, the common helpfulness of man for man; the justice, the righteousness, the truth, of which these are the special illustrations, are what make man at one with God, and are the saving graces of life. The modes in which these virtues manifest themselves may change

Digitized by Google

with the special needs and the varying wants of society, but the duty, the spirit, the principle of them will ever be the same, to-day, yesterday, and for ever.

3. But further, in this parable Jesus teaches the solidarity, the organic unity, and oneness of the human race, in short, that "all men are brethren." "Inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these MY *brethren*, ye did it unto me," he said, speaking out of a heart of boundless sympathies. And is it not so with every good and generous-minded man? Jesus here declares one of those universal laws which not only reach down to the depths of man's nature, but also through all ages. When we meet a man who has been kind to the suffering, helpful to the needy, self-sacrificing for the advancement of the good of others, do we not feel open-soulled towards him, and do we not feel as he had been doing personal kindnesses to us all our lives? If we do not, it is time for self-examination, and strict enquiry into our spiritual condition. But they are few with whom it is not so. What is the admiration and love of men for philanthropists like John Howard, Florence Nightingale, and Mary Carpenter? what is our kindling sense of the grandeur and divineness of human nature in the presence of men like Loyd Garrison, David Livingstone, and Charles Dickens?—nay, what is our reverence and love of Jesus himself, but this? Every man who feels his organic unity with the human race—and he who is divinest in heart and soul will feel it most deeply and strongly—will joy most greatly in the benefactions which great souls bring to mankind. Bring to mankind, I say, for they are but the almoners of Him from whom cometh every good and perfect gift,—yea, will he not feel gladdened by them, as if they had been brought to him personally? Are there not men who live in history, not on account of their kingliness of intellect, or the wide dominion they swayed while living, but because of the beauty of their lives, the self-sacrificing generosities they showed, the sweet virtues they practised, and the charm of vital character they displayed, who, if they were to come on earth again, would find open house throughout the whole civilised world, because they were so grandly human, and so divinely large and deep in their sympathies? For they have touched and kindled every human heart, and made all men feel that what they did for individuals or communities they did for the race, and each special person of which the race is composed. When we read the story of the poor lame cobbler, John Pounds, how he went into the streets of Portsmouth, and persuaded the ragged urchins, who were growing up to become criminals and convicts, to go with him into his little workshop, which was also his living and sleeping room, that he might teach them to read and write, and quicken into action the love and morality in their hearts; sharing with them his dinner of roast potatoes, and his supper of brown bread, that he might win them to a virtuous life—and doing this, not for a week or a month, but for years, till hundreds of honest, industrious, and religious men, who else would have been thieves, outcasts, and convicts, blessed him, and ministered unto him with grateful hearts,—I say, when we enter that little Unitarian chapel in Portsmouth where he had worshipped while living, and wherein his body was laid when his earthly duties ended, and we read the modest tablet which records his virtues, we involuntarily put ourselves in the place of those he rescued from sin and misery; we feel as if we owed him much personally, as indeed we all do, and we inwardly exclaim: "Inasmuch, John, as ye did it to the lowest of these our brothers, you did it unto us also!"

And if *we* feel thus, do you not think that the great soul of Jesus, so deep and universal in his sympathies, would feel so too, in contemplating the ministry of good men to the welfare of his kind? Was not this parable his way of declaring this fact? This parable is the statement of the solidarity of the human race, the oneness of nature, sympathy, interest, and affection, the full fellowship of men, that is. And until we gain this enthusiasm of humanity, this identification of ourselves with mankind, which was so vital and so powerful in the character of Jesus, we have not attained to true human life, we are yet in the lower sphere of mere animal existence.

So far from this parable, then, proving the Godhead of Jesus, it proclaims aloud, not only his union, but also his oneness, his identity with human nature. He was a divine man in character—that is, he was

Digitized by Google

like God; but likeness is not identity, but rather implies distinction of being, while it declares sameness of quality. Besides, we never talk about *a divine God*, though we do of *divine men*, showing that we hold, that in the first, the divineness is the being Himself—that is, if it were possible for Him to cease to be divine, he would cease to be God; in the second, it is a quality of his being to be attained, not an essential of mere existence. Jesus was divine in the same way in which every heroic soul who has even given himself to God for man, is divine—that is, as a son of God, in the holiness of his life, and the divineness of his character; sharing with the Father of all that quality of spiritual being which makes Him good to all, and the watchful, tender guardian of all their ways.

Accrington. WILLIAM MITCHELL.

INDIRECT ATTACKS UPON THE DOCTRINE OF HELL TORMENTS.

Extracts from certain Roman Catholic books, intended for the teaching of children, have been introduced into several of the newspapers, as illustrating the kind of religious education that is afforded by means of Government assistance, and what may be expected to be given in Ireland.

From a child's book, entitled, "THE SIGHT OF HELL":—

"See, in the middle of that red-hot floor stands a girl; she looks about sixteen years old. Her feet are bare. She has neither shoes nor stockings. Listen! She speaks. She says: 'I have been standing on this red-hot floor for years. Day and night my only standing-place has been this red-hot floor. Look at my burnt and bleeding feet. Let me off this red-hot floor for one moment—only for a single moment.'"

We do not see how an orthodox person can object to these representations of the miseries of the damned. In order to make the lesson which is taught in the Creeds intelligible to children, it is put into the form of a picture. The same fearful doctrine in the abstract may be found in Dr Watt's Catechism, or *The Religion of Little Children under seven years of age*:—

23. "What must become of you if you are wicked?" "If I am wicked I shall be sent down to everlasting fire in Hell, among wicked and miserable creatures."

A Short Catechism for Young Children, by the late Rev. John Brown of Haddington:—

"What will become of you if you die in your sin?" "I must go to hell with the wicked." "What kind of a place is hell?" "A place of endless torment, being a lake that burns with fire and brimstone."

The Mother's Catechism for a Young Child, said to be used very extensively in the home and school in Scotland:—

"What sort of a place is hell?" "It is a place of torment, being a lake that burns with fire and brimstone for evermore." "What do the wicked in hell?" "They roar, curse and blaspheme for ever."

The doctrine of torments in hell is not only held by the Catholics, but also by most orthodox Protestants.

In objecting to the teaching of the Roman Catholic interpretation of Hell Torments, the doctrine of many other sects is attacked.

We trust it may excite attention and thought, and lead many to renounce a professed belief which casts an imputation upon the character of God.

A PARABLE.

Said Christ our Lord, "I will go and see
How the men, my brethren, believe in me."
He passed not again through the gate of birth,
But made himself known to the children of earth.

Then said the chief priests, and rulers, and kings,
"Behold, now, the giver of all good things;
Go to, let us welcome with pomp and state
Him who alone is mighty and great."

With carpets of gold the ground they spread
Wherever the Son of Man should tread,
And in palace-chambers lofty and rare
They lodged him, and served him with kingly fare.

Great organs surged through arches dim
Their jubilant floods in praise of him,
And in church and palace, and judgment-hall,
He saw his image high over all.

But still, wherever his steps they led,
The Lord in sorrow bent down his head,
And from under the heavy foundation-stones,
The son of Mary heard bitter groans.

And in church and palace, and judgment-hall,
He marked great fissures that rent the wall,
And opened wider and yet more wide
As the living foundation heaved and sighed.

"Have ye founded your thrones and altars, then,
On the bodies and souls of living men?
And think ye that building shall endure,
Which shelters the noble and crushes the poor?"

"With gates of silver and bars of gold,
Ye have fenced my sheep from their Father's fold:
I have heard the dropping of their tears
In heaven, these eighteen hundred years."

"O Lord and Master, not ours the guilt,
We build but as our Fathers built;
Behold thine images, how they stand,
Sovereign and sole, through all our land."

"Our task is hard,—with sword and flame
To hold thy earth forever the same,
And with sharp crooks of steel to keep
Still, as thou leftest them, thy sheep."

Then Christ sought out an artisan,
A low-browed, stunted, haggard man,
And a motherless girl, whose fingers thin
Pushed from her faintly want and sin.

These set he in the midst of them,
And as they drew back their garment-hem,
For fear of defilement, "Lo, here," said he,
"The images ye have made of me!"—*Lowell.*

Digitized by Google

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

FOURTH LESSON.

BY this time we will presume that our Pupils, grown familiar with their Alphabet, and many words, are beginning their Greek Testaments, and we will turn aside to help. We imagine them at the beginning of Matthew, having spelt over

ευαγγελιον	κατα	Ματθαιον.
The good message	according to	Matthew.

Here notice before the double γ we must add the nasal sound of n; and that always

γγ, γκ, γχ, or γξ

takes the sound of n before it exactly as if an ν were spelt into the word.

Now, with the English and Greek Testaments open side by side, and with one finger on the Greek and one on the English, we begin

βιβλος	γενεσεως	Ιησου	Χριστου,
The book	of the birth	of Jesus	Christ,

The first word comes like an old friend; so *the Bible* means *the book*. Notice the two last words end with ου like the genitive case of the Article του *of the;* in which case they are.

Where we begin a sentence with a conjunction for the first word, as *and*, *for*, *but*, in Greek it is made the second word; so all through the chapter, and indeed constantly, δε *and* stands second, but we must pick it out and take it first.

The chief part of this chapter is so good and easy an exercise to a beginner, because the proper names will help him to keep his place, that we will leave him to it alone, and turn on to chap. ii. Take the first four words

του	δε	Ιησου	γεννηθεντος
of the	And	Jesus	having been born

meaning *And after Jesus was born.* This is an idiom, or arrangement of words very common in Greek, called the Genitive Absolute, meaning *Genitive standing alone*, or with no cause for its being in that case (like the Ablative Absolute in Latin.)

Verse 13 begins with the same idiom—

αναχωρησαντων	δε	αυτων,
having departed	And	of them,

meaning *And when they had departed.*

But to return to chap. ii. verse 1, notice

μαγοι	απο	ανατολων,
wise men	from	the risings,

meaning from *the East*, or the place where sun and stars all have their risings; and in verse 2, the same word is used in the singular

τη	ανατολη,
the	rising,

when used for one particular star, and not for the East generally. Notice in verse 4

συναγαγων.
gathering together

Further on we shall find the word synagogue is nearly the same, showing how with them, as with us, the word *church* originally meant the people. Notice in verse 4.

του	λαου.
of the	people.

whence our *laity.*

As the task of fitting word to word from the English on to Greek that does not keep the same order of words is, at first, of course, a difficulty, we will try to point out a few guiding and stepping stones.

Our second lesson has already shown how, by means of the Article, to find the Nouns and their cases; and the pupil knowing these, when he can also see by the first letters which is the Verb in the sentence, he will generally be able to be pretty sure of the rest.

Now, the number of the Greek Tense-endings is so great that we begin with a few of those most easy to recognise, first remarking, that our pupils are not to be frightened at the sight of the number in their Grammars. They will find that it is but a very small proportion that they have to use; and we hope to put them in the way of knowing these by sight before very long. First, then,

Notice the following Tense-endings :—

μεν is 1st person plural, } Active of all tenses, &
τε is 2d person plural, } Passive Aorist tenses,

as in Matt ii. 2—ειδομεν, ηλθομεν,
we have seen, we have come,

Digitized by Google

and verse 8,—εξετασατε, εὑρητε,
do you enquire, you have found,
απαγγειλατε.
do you bring word.

θη is 3d person singular of the Passive I. Aorist,
as in v. 3,—εταραχθη, v. 16, ενεπαιχθη.
he was troubled, he was mocked.

ων is { Present, Imperfect, Future, } Active, Participle.
σας I. Aorist, }

see verse 4,—συναγαγων, v. 8, ελθων,
gathering together, having come,
v. 13, λεγων, v. 3, ακουσας, v. 7. καλεσας,
saying, having heard, having called,
v. 8, πεμψας.
having sent.

μενος is { Present, Imperfect, Future, } Passive and Middle, Participle

θεις I. Aorist, Passive, Participle
as in verse 2,—τεχθεις, v. 6, ἡγουμενος,
having been born, a ruling [one]
v. 13, εγερθεις.
having been raised.

ουτες, σαντες, μενοι, θεντες, } Plurals of the four Participles above.

see verse 1,—λεγοντες, v. 9, ακουσαντες,
saying, having heard,
v. 8, πορευθεντες, v. 10, ιδοντες,
having been gone, having seen,
v. 11, ελθοντες, πεσοντες,
having come, having fallen down,
v. 11, αναξαντες, v. 12, χρηματισθεντες.
having opened, having been warned.

Below we give the well-known important text in Controversial Theology, and when our readers have read it, if they will then compare it with the passage in their English Testaments, they will see how it has been falsified by a large addition in order to support the doctrine of the Trinity.

The text simply declares that Jesus is proved to be the Christ by the *water* of his baptism, the *blood* of his crucifixion, and the *divine spirit* that appears in his teachings.

1 John, v., 6–8.

Οὗτος εστιν ὁ ελθων
This [person] is the [person] having come
δι' ὑδατος και αἱματος, Ιησους ὁ
through water and blood, Jesus the
Χριστος· ουκ εν τῳ ὑδατι
Christ [or anointed]; not in the water
μονον, αλλ' εν τῳ ὑδατι και τῳ
only, but in the water and the
αἱματι· και το πνευμα εστι το
blood; and the spirit is the [thing]
μαρτυρουν, ὁτι το πνευμα εστιν
bearing witness, because the spirit is
ἡ αληθεια. Ὁτι τρεις εισιν οἱ
the truth. Because three are the
μαρτυρουντες. το πνευμα, και το
bearing witness; the spirit, and the
ὑδωρ, και το αἱμα· και οἱ τρεις εις
water, and the blood; and the three into
το ἑν εισιν.
the one [thing] are.

Notice that the last το *the* is neuter, and agrees with ἑν *one*, both being neuter, and referring to one aim or object, not to one person. The interpolated words are twenty four in number, and come in immediately after μαρτυρουντες.

THE HISTORY OF THE FORGERY

is as follows:—The oldest copies of the New Testament are, as our readers will know, Greek Manuscripts, written by hand as the name implies. And none of these contain the verse of the celebrated forgery, 1 John v. 7. Nor did the Latin Translation, the Vulgate, contain it either, up to the year 800 after Christ. But the copies of the Latin Vulgate that were made soon after that year began to contain that verse, though nobody knows by whom it was put in, or exactly when.

Centuries afterwards, when Erasmus, the great scholar, living while printing was new, published in 1516 the first Greek Testament ever printed, he printed from the Greek Manuscripts, none of which contained any of the interpolated words.

Nobody greatly noticed the omission at the first edition; but after the second edition the clergy were upon him; for they said, "This will never do! you have left out the Trinity!" "But," answered Erasmus, "It is not in the Greek; I printed only from what I saw." But his persecutors were too strong for him; his income arose chiefly from pensions from crowned

Digitized by Google

heads, prelates, and men of rank, and Erasmus had no fancy for being a martyr. He was frightened at the storm that rose, and said, "If they could show him *one* Greek Manuscript with the words they wanted, he would print them." And forthwith they set to work, and had one written on purpose! And poor Erasmus, beaten though not deceived, printed accordingly.

And we have now the one Greek Manuscript that was written on purpose for Erasmus, containing the celebrated forgery.

Thus Erasmus's unfortunate cowardice has handed down the wrongful addition to the present day; and even now we are wondering whether our present Bishops will have the honesty to leave it out of their coming translation.

Modern editors of the Greek Testament have given us a pure text, and private translators have translated from these. But shame to say, the Received Text being adopted and translated by all Europe, has spread and is still spreading by thousands and by millions this grave error.

We have to notice with regret a mistake on line 7 of the Greek in the Third Lesson, where πων should have been των. But we hope and think our readers will have been forward enough to have found out this for themselves.

ANSWERS TO OUR QUESTIONS ON THE BIBLE.

1. From the time when Solomon built his temple in Jerusalem to the day that Stephen made his last speech, there had been an increasing struggle between the priests of Jerusalem, and the Jews of the other parts of the land, and of foreign countries, as to Jerusalem's claim to ecclesiastical superiority. In opposition to this claim, Stephen, who was a Greek Jew, a nonconformist, quotes the Bible to show that when God appeared to Abraham it was not in Jerusalem, but in Mesopotamia; when he spoke to Moses it was not in Jerusalem, but in Egypt, and in the desert; that, under the Judges, the Ark of Jehovah did not rest in Jerusalem, but was carried about by the Fathers from place to place; and that, though Solomon built for God a House, yet the Most High dwelleth not in houses made with hands. The argument was put so forcibly that it could only be answered by violence.

2. In Acts xx. 2, we are told that the Apostle Paul paid a second visit to Greece. But we have no particulars of his doings there, nor do we know what cities he then visited. We are left at liberty to conjecture what his movements were by the help of his Epistles. Now, as in 2 Cor. i. he gives his reasons for not visiting Corinth a second time after he had promised to do so; and we may reasonably suppose that on this journey, when he was in the neighbourhood of that city, he stopt short of going there. And this will explain how in 2 Cor. xii. 14 he says that he is willing to come to them a third time, when in fact he had only visited them once.

3. The Book of Jasher is quoted in Joshua x. for the sun and moon standing still to give Israel time to slaughter their enemies, and in 2 Sam. i. for a beautiful poem called the Bow, which David sang as a lament on the death of Saul and Jonathan.

4. Chapter xxxi. of Jeremiah was written after the captives of Judah had returned home from captivity, and the writer hopes for the return of the northern tribes also. It belongs to the time of Ezra, whose appointment to be governor of Judea, if we may judge from the Book of Esther, was brought about by the influence of that queen over her husband, the Persian king. That may be the persuasion spoken of as "a woman coming round a man."

5. In the Book of Daniel, and again in the Apocryphal Book of Tobit, we read of angels having names, such as Michael and Raphael.

6. The High Places, so often blamed in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, were hills on which the people offered sacrifices to God. Mount Moriah, on which David's altar stood, was such a hill. But after Solomon built his temple on Mount Moriah, and established the order of priests in Jerusalem, these ecclesiastics, jealous for their own profit and importance, denounced all altars, except their own, as being unlawful. This jealousy we have spoken of in the answer to Question I.

Digitized by Google

THE BROAD CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

WE had lately an opportunity of listening to addresses delivered by the Revs. Dr Watson of Dundee, Professor Campbell of St Andrews, Dr Smith of Glasgow, and Dr Wallace of Edinburgh, at a meeting called for the purpose of supporting the present Education Bill, introduced into Parliament by the Lord Advocate. It was in connection with the "Religious Difficulty" in Popular Education that we had the gratification of hearing sentiments respecting the nature of true religion, which gave us much encouragement.

The Rev. Dr Watson of Dundee maintained that the child has certain rights—these are life, health, and education. He did not go out of his way to contrast his position with the Creed of his Church, which, as is well known, leaves no room for human agencies to help the child destined for everlasting perdition to escape from his fate.

The Rev. Dr Wallace of Greyfriars, Edinburgh, spoke directly upon the "Religious Difficulty," and in the course of his address he incidently expressed his opinion, such as Unitarians have always avowed, to the effect that religion is deeper and nobler than all dogmatic and sectarian formularies. Indeed, Theology was placed side by side with politics. He asserted that the solution of the "Religious Difficulty" was to be found in the exclusion of all sectarian catechisms, and by reading the Bible without sectarian comment before or after the hours devoted to secular instruction. He gave an illustration of how he would teach the Bible in an unsectarian way.

"Reading or teaching the Bible meant, as he understood it, the same as reading a newspaper. He would read and teach the Bible in the spirit of the resolution in this way:—Suppose he were to take the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis. He would tell the child the dictionary meaning of the word beginning—created out of nothing—but he would also mention that some people considered that creation in this case meant making out of some pre-existing material. Taking the first verse of the first chapter of the Gospel of John he would teach the child the dictionary meaning of the word beginning, and tell him also what the great mass of Church historians meant by the expression Word; and would also tell him fairly and frankly what the great mass of the people of the country—Protestant and Catholic—understood by the expression "The Word was God;" but he would also mention that there was a small minority who maintained that the proper meaning of the expression was that the Word was Divine; and he would do this because, if he did not do so, the child when he grew up would be likely to think in the direction of the view which had been placed under a bann, and which had not been fairly put before him."

Our purpose is not now to criticise the method illustrated above. We like the spirit of the man who would offer both sides of a question of theology. Referring to the necessity of teaching, to some extent, what he termed "Comparative Theology," Dr Wallace spoke of "a science known by the name of geology, and they had those who believed that the whole universe was made in the interval between Sunday morning and Friday night." This latter remark was received with ironical laughter, in which, to our surprise, several reputedly orthodox clergymen on the platform joined.

The Rev. Dr W. C. Smith is a well-known clergyman of Glasgow, connected with the Free Church, who, some years ago, was charged with the heresy of maintaining that the moral law of Christ was superior to that of Moses. In that matter he is regarded as having given way to his would-be persecutors. In his address on the evils of the denominational system of education, one could not help feeling, that, although the dogmatic bonds of the Free Church were still around him, he did not feel them. We think our readers will like the tone of the following:—

"He objected to denominationalism, because they had already a system of caste that sooner or later might become as great a tyranny as any that existed in India. Because he believed in the deep unity which pervaded all Christian men in their faith in the one God and his Christ, he objected to a system of denominationalism which, ignoring all that is common to them, seized hold by the little child from his earliest years and trained him, if not only, at least chiefly, to the recognition of those trifles and paltry things by which they were separated from each other."

Sarcastic references were made during the evening to the dogmatic party; and, with one exception, the Bible was not

Digitized by Google

spoken of as the "Divine Word." "The great book of the world's history" seemed to be preferred to the old-fashioned orthodox phrase, "the Word of God."

The Rev. George Gilfillan of Dundee did not speak on the occasion referred to above, but he addressed a letter to the *Dundee Advertiser*, expressing his opinions with respect to the position of the speakers as to the Bible as a school book, from which it may be learned what Mr Gilfillan's view of the subject is. He is for the entire exclusion of the Bible from the common schools; and in the course of his letter he remarks—

"I am astonished that a man of Dr Wallace's enlightenment should do anything which seemingly seeks to conserve that superstitious reverence for the mere letter of the Scriptures which lingers on in Scotland I yield to no man, and certainly not to Dr Wallace, in reverence for the great spiritual ideas and facts which the Bible contains; but I have no sympathy with "Bibliolatry"—that worship of the letter—that pattering over the mere verbal statements and names of the Scripture, whether understood or not, as over the beads of a rosary—that spirit of purely Popish adoration which led once, and with many leads still, to a preference of the 10th chapter of Nehemiah to a page of Plato or of Milton."

Such are some of the points in the addresses, and in the letter, which at once convey to a Unitarian the signs of the presence of unorthodox ideas. We find it difficult to reconcile the signing of the Westminster Confession, and asserting, as was in effect done, that the essential in Christianity was to be found in the two Commandments — the Sermon on the Mount, and the story of the Prodigal. It is a remarkable feature of the Broad Church in Scotland that its leaders address their sentiments extemporaneously to the people, or through the columns of a newspaper.

MISSIONARY WORK.

MANCHESTER.

There is every token of an awakened interest in missionary enterprize, so far as regards our liberal faith, in the neighbourhood of Manchester —every congregation seems to be active in seeking to extend its influence. In nothing is this more manifest than in the endeavour, in all directions, for the erection of more commodious and more handsome churches. At Altrincham and at Monton efforts have been made in this direction; and the attempt to build a suitable church at Pendleton—thanks to the energy of the Rev. Brooke Herford—bids fair to be crowned with success. At the Annual Meeting of the Manchester District Unitarian Association the other night, Pendleton was the absorbing theme; and before the meeting separated, the £500 already available towards building was doubled, —£1500 has still to be raised—and doubtless will be raised in due course. By-the-bye, I must not forget that the chairman of the meeting to which I refer, was Mr Ivie Mackie, whom his Manchester friends were gratified to see again taking a prominent part in a denominational meeting in their city. I have but little special news to add. The Failsworth congregation have advertised their appeal for a new chapel. Their cause is good; but the appeal is inopportune. Certainly local help will hardly be likely to be strong while there are so many attempts at building in the district, and while Pendleton is in want of aid. The Middleton friends have purchased the Temperance Hall, in which they meet, and are fitting it up as a regular chapel. The Rev. W. G. Cadman is just entering on his duties at Miles Platting — previously a Mission station, dependent on supplies. His new centre is only about a mile and a half from his old one at Failsworth. The pulpit there is vacant, as also that at Oldham. The vacancies at Mossley and Stalybridge have been filled. To the former place the Rev. J. G. Slater of Aberdeen is coming; to the latter, Rev. A. Ashworth of Chatham.

LEEDS.

We learn from the *Mill-Hill Chapel Record* that a series of addresses is now in course of delivery in the Congregational Hall of Mill-Hill Chapel, on week evenings, upon the following subjects:— "Authority and the Scriptures," "The Doctrine that Jesus was God tested by his teachings and practice," "Did the Apostles believe Jesus to be God," "The Death of Jesus." "These addresses are designed to state, in the clearest way, the ground of the differences which part us from the rest of our brethren in the great household of faith."

Among the notices we find an invitation to the Lord's Supper, which appears to us to state very clearly the general position of the Unitarian Churches, but which may be unknown to some of our readers, we therefore quote it:—"This Service is freely open to all, whether members of the congregation or not; no profession of faith or conduct is exacted; no questions of any kind are asked. We 'do this in remembrance' of our Master. If there are any who do not wish to participate in the administration of the elements, but who would still like to be present at the commemoration, their attendance is earnestly invited."

Reports are given of the Holbeck Domestic Mission, and of the *Hunslet Unitarian Church*. The latter is referred to as "the most encouraging that there has ever been in connection with the Church." We introduce a sentence which shows that Lady Preachers are not confined to the United States, for "the Quarterly Collections were made on Sunday, March 3, after excellent sermons by Miss Rollinson."

Digitized by Google

CHATHAM.

The Rev. Alex. Ashworth concluded, on March 6, a course of five Wednesday Evening Lectures, in answer to the question, "What do Unitarian Christians believe?" The lectures have excited some public attention. They have been well attended, and attentively listened to. At the last lecture the chapel was nearly full. The subject was "God."—Gal. iii. 20. One gentleman put a number of questions to the lecturer, which he answered to the satisfaction of the inquirer. There is little doubt that much good will be the result of this effort.

BROMLEY, KENT.

The Rev. Robert Spears of London has delivered two lectures in the Town Hall. There were about sixty persons in attendance Tracts were liberally distributed. This is a new field for Missionary effort.

BIRMINGHAM.

A large meeting of Unitarians was held in the Town Hall, on March 19, on the occasion of a visit of a deputation from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. A correspondent of the *Unitarian Herald* writes—"The meeting has been a great success. More than 1800 persons were present; and the speeches were of a very high order.

DUNDEE.

The Seventh Annual Soiree of the Unitarian Christian Church was held on March 22, in the Schoolroom -the Rev. Henry Williamson in the chair. A very pleasant and agreeable evening was spent.

TO OUR READERS.

We find ourselves compelled to make an earnest appeal to all those who are able and willing to help us in obtaining a larger number of Subscribers. We have received many words of approval; and especially among congregations formed of poor people we have obtained support. We cannot afford to advertise to the extent necessary to make our "Missionary" widely known. Let all who can and will help us to supply cheap Unitarian information to the people.

NOTICE.

A Digest of the Work of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association during the Year 1871.

We take the following from this interesting pamphlet:—

"The sum of £1297 has been voted during the year to 36 different Churches for the support of Public Worship and for Missionary work and Lectures; and free grants of 91,500 tracts and 2480 volumes of books for Chapels and Public Libraries, and for distribution in India, and to Ministers with very small incomes."

"Since January 1871, the Association has published 16,250 volumes of books and 89,000 pamphlets and tracts, and has assisted in the publication of 7000 tracts in the Italian language, and organised depots in Paris, Berlin and Milan, for the sale of Unitarian works. The aim of the Publishing department is to place our literature in the hands of the people at the lowest possible cost."

The foreign correspondence contains interesting extracts from letters from the Unitarian and Universalist Churches of America, from Paris, Lyons, &c. From Italy G. Campanella writes:

"It is not possible for me to express how deeply the truth that the Father-God is all love towards his creatures, is engraved upon my heart. To introduce it amongst my countrymen, I would willingly give my whole being. * * * Letters from Rome give me every reason to hope and believe that the time has already arrived when the great principles of liberal Christianity may be preached there with every prospect of ultimate success."

Ferdinando Bracciforti, from Milan, writes:—

"I do believe that Channing's truly catholic spirit and elevating views of a practical Christianity are highly calculated to win many hearts in Italy, and trust that God's blessing will rest on my poor but, in one sense at least, faithful translation, which will continue to preach to my countrymen when I am in the grave."

We regret our space will not permit us to quote interesting paragraphs relating to Germany, France, Holland, Hungary, India, Australia, and various towns in the United Kingdom, all of which agree in giving assurance that Unitarian Christianity is making progress in the hearts of thoughtful men.

A useful Catalogue of Books and Tracts is appended. We recommend our readers to send for a copy, which, we presume, may be obtained for a couple of stamps, from Mr Henry Brace, 178 Strand, London.

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

No. 5. MAY 1872. PRICE 1D.

THE MISSIONARY WORK OF THE UNITARIAN CHURCH.

IT may be the case that those persons who have found the name Unitarian as most expressive of their Theological Position have not generally accepted of a clear recognition of the responsibilities resting upon them to make known their manner of professing Christianity. Without any attempt being made to secure identity of belief, Unitarians are perhaps more in agreement than are the members of any other class of Christians. In the Presbyterian Church, the knowledge of religion consists principally of the power to recite the answers of the Shorter Catechism. We hear sometimes of young persons preparing to join the Kirk, and are told of the weary time such have in studying the Shorter Catechism to be ready for the questions of the Minister.

We do not hesitate to affirm that no Unitarian would seek to enter any Church in such a way as that. The orthodox candidate for church membership is not asked to test the creed, but to accept it without question. The Unitarian Christian is so, generally, in consequence of his having, to the extent of his power and opportunity, become "persuaded in his own mind." Just as there is freedom and agreement among men of science in most fundamentals, so is there freedom and agreement, in the great facts of religion, with Unitarians. Unitarians believe in the trustworthiness of their own faculties. They risk the danger of following reason. At least, then, Unitarians have demonstrated that, when men are left free to form their own religious beliefs they do not separate from each other, but find at last certain grand ideas which are intimately connected with human nature itself, and which serve to place religion above the disputes of philosophy and theology.

Many who are at this moment Unitarians have been orthodox. The contrast between the two positions is so great, and the fact that many persons still in connection with the Popular Theology are perplexed by the contradiction of their highest and best thoughts by the teaching of the creed-bound clergy, offers good grounds for the earnest consideration of—how Unitarians ought to make known their reasons of protest against the mischievous errors which prevail in the churches? We rejoice to notice, from a revival of the missionary spirit amongst us, this question is to be answered by the declaration, that every legitimate means should be taken to make known to others a method of interpreting the Scriptures which takes away from the minds of Unitarians any ground for believing the horrible dogma of an Endless Hell, or of an angry, vindictive Deity, or of regarding Jesus, in some unaccountable way, God. There is an important consideration connected with the future of Christianity. We believe that true men will ever reverence pure Christianity. But it is the fact, that, owing to the irrational and contradictory teachings of orthodoxy, many persons have been led to renounce the popular

Digitized by Google

form of Christianity; and some of these have expressed their gratification that, in the Unitarian position, a way is open for them to join heartily the Christian Church.

In Scotland it is apparently but a question of a few years before the rule of Calvin will be at an end. What then? Shall people be left to deny the historical Jesus in rejecting the Jesus of the Church? The missionary work of the Unitarian Church is to shew the important distinction between the Christianity of Creeds and the Christianity of Jesus. In the Unitarian body there are many men who, from their culture and ability, are well fitted to join in this work, but, in their present positions, their usefulness is confined mainly to the members of their own congregations. No doubt the most effective way to spread a knowledge of the views held by Unitarians is through the living voice; but it is impossible to do this with the small number of missionaries we have to present our message to men who do not know of its existence. The press offers a means for utilising the latent power which exists in abundance in the Unitarian denomination. We have found ministers of country congregations who have expressed their willingness to contribute to the pages of the *Missionary* the results of their study and meditation. The people want information. In this day of cheap literature, it becomes necessary to offer the knowledge of Unitarian Christianity at a low price. We know this has been done successfully in the case of Channing's Works, and Dr Priestley's History. But a steady supply is required, and for this, we need the periodical. After delivering a lecture to perfect strangers on Unitarian views, in a town where such had never before been given, we have felt the need of a cheap missionary organ to recommend to inquirers. It is, we consider, no disparagement to other publications of the body if we state that there was not one that suited this purpose. Without the help of any of the Missionary Associations, at our own risk, we have thus far published the *Missionary;* and we frankly tell our supporters and friends that, with the present circulation, it is not paying its way. But the fact that we have received many commendations from all parts of the country, and that our paper is going month by month into homes where no Unitarian influence had ever entered before, makes us hope that those who realise the mission of the Unitarian Church will come to our aid.

THE BIBLE IN THE PULPIT.

(Communicated.)

A FEW years ago Bishop Wilberforce, when pressing upon Convocation the duty of making a revised translation of the Bible, said, that if they, the Clergy, did not soon circulate one, the Dissenters would. But he gave the Dissenters credit for more zeal for truth, and for more independence of character, than they seem to possess. It is true that the Dissenters, and the Unitarians in particular, have made several improved versions; but we have never heard of the Royal Version being displaced from the pulpit desk. This arises from no superstitious reverence for the Bible, but from a reverence for authority. Ministers have sometimes put aside the Bible altogether; they have also occasionally put it aside for Coleridge, for Carlyle, or for Emerson; from some reason or other they have in no pulpit put aside the Authorised Bible in favour of a more correct version. They have in some cases made the change in the Sunday School, but have not yet ventured to do it in the pulpit.

This is clearly a case of Unitarians not acting up to their convictions. Our congregations ought to ask the ministers to read at all times that version of the Bible which they think most faithfully translated, and which best represents the meaning of the original. They shrink, we fancy, from the reproach of having a Bible of their own. But they have not shrunk from the reproach of having a religion of their own. They should in each case think the reproach an honour. At anyrate they should not fail to act up to their convictions.

The question, "What is true?" ought to stand on the threshold of every religious inquiry.—*Whately.*

Digitized by Google

JUSTIFICATION BY WORKS.

JUSTIFICATION, we saw in the last paper, is making men just. The question arises, How is this done? One answer is, "Man is justified by works. His deeds make him just." No; man's deeds may declare him just, but can never make him just. To say so is to confound the process with the result. Whence the process? Whence the justifying power? Unclean hands can be made clean only by soap and water. So an unclean heart can be made clean only by some cleansing power. The cleansing element for the hands is not the hands themselves. The same is true of the heart. Without soap and water the hands may be rubbed together for ever, and will never become clean. The pressure and the friction will only make the dark dye darker, deeper, yea indelible. An extraneous power must be brought into operation. Human justice has, with its short-sightedness, looked at the problem, and appointed punishment for the remedy. The culprit shall be made just by his works. "He is unwilling to cooperate";—"flog him." "He has been flogged";—"flog him again." Surely he is cured now. He will lie no more. He will steal no more. On the contrary, he lies and steals more than ever. "Flog him again." And flogged he is until you have flogged all power out of him. It is not an uncommon result for the victim of your unrighteousness to be punished until you have done your worst, and he comes to the gallows. This is law. This is man's way of justifying the criminal. Its end is disappointment to society, and destruction to its trangressors. The reader has seen a coil of chains on the front of a jail. It is a true and faithful emblem of what goes on within—the court of justice, as it is ironically termed, included. Force is its method of justification; and with a human being the application of unqualified force is simply ruin. It undermines and obliterates the very power whose weakness occasioned the first breach of the law, and so of necessity entails the suppresssion of the remaining strength more and more, the longer it is applied, until the man is truly killed, having, in a certain half-life, half-death, the shadow of the man. The reader has seen on the front of a gaol another not less appropriate emblem. It is a female figure carved in stone, bearing in its right hand a sword, and having its eyes bandaged. Two most incongruous metaphors! Justice to strike it sees not whom, or where, or how! The justice of man is not the justice of God, but simply retributory vengeance;—"an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." Man's ordinary justice is gross injustice. Bad government makes bad men, and bad men are made worse by bad, that is, blind and ruthless legislation. Yes; stone is the right material for that figure to be made of. Hearts of stone create, propagate, and multiply criminality. And this is what is called Christendom! above eighteen hundred years after the merciful Jesus came into the world to reveal the Father of humankind, and to commiserate, help, heal, strengthen, and restore the weak, the sinful, the fallen! Witness the deadening effect of a religion (O, the misnomer!) of dogma! The priests and the lawyers have laid Christ in a tomb hewn out in a rock, and rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre.—Matt. xxvii. 60. Justification by works is triumphant and supreme. Similar issues, on a smaller scale, are of constant recurrence. Here is a governess, who, unpenetrated by the spirit of the gospel, relies mainly on prohibitions. "No," and "don't," are the weapons of her warfare. She has to do with indocile children, and is very particular to make them obedient, and get them into order. Lynx-eyed, as well as rigorous, she sees all their faults, and none of their virtues—if they have any, and few enough will they have after undergoing her petrifying processes. However, she has undertaken a duty and will perform it. Her boys are fond of play, rough play; her girls love dolls, and chatter. These are not childish frailties, but "faults," "sad faults," shameful faults," "intolerable misdeeds," and "must and shall be put an end to." Children, badly treated, begin by being wilful, and end by becoming contumacious and mischievous. Such is the result of Miss Severity's discipline. By the simple

Digitized by Google

force of prohibition; by ceaselessly calling or screaming out "ho!" "don't," "you shan't," "I'll punish you," "bad boy," "wicked girl," and all the retinue of scholastic negation and vituperation, she confirms the tendencies she ought to remove, and makes her pupils as bad as her language implies. A vulgar proverb says, "Give a dog a bad name and you hang him." What is true of a dog is true of a child. Call a child a liar and you will make him one. So true is Paul's averment: "I had not known sin but by the law. And the Commandment which was meant for life I found to be unto death, for sin, taking occasion (or impulse) by the Commandment, slew me."—Romans vii. 8, *seq.* "I will," in untold instances, would never have been uttered and carried into effect but for some unwise "Thou shalt," or "thou shalt not." And suppose that I do what you bid, am I really good? If I do what you bid, simply because you bid it, my act is the act of a slave, and possesses no moral quality. Possessing no moral quality, it conveys no moral nutriment, and so communicates no moral strength. Even if I do an act of my own free will, the act itself is not necessarily good. The quality of the act depends on the quality of the motive. The act is colourless where there is no motive. If the motive is self-serving of any kind, the act is not virtuous, unless the end is the supply of your natural wants, and unless the means for the supply are uninjurious to others. Any act whatever, considered as merely an act, is, as such, destitute of moral quality. Not being just itself, it cannot tend to make its performer just. The qualities of all our acts lie in their sources. Moreover, what mere human power can produce works such as law demands? The deeds of the best of men fall short of their own ideals. Measured by the divine standard, they become painfully conscious of their own insufficiency, and that sense of demerit will be keenest at times in the loftiest characters. True holiness is rather a silent growth than the last effort of a desperate struggle. What men need is not a code of laws, but a principle of life, and that principle is supplied by the Heavenly Father in his son Jesus, and in his own quickening, cherishing, nourishing, strengthening, refining, and elevating spirit—the spirit of holiness, which is the spirit of truth, and the spirit of power.

We have seen man's way of justifying man; in the next paper we shall contemplate God's way.

JOHN R. BEARD.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

HAVING read Mr Sharpe's paper on "The Age of the Book of Job," I would respectfully suggest some considerations in favour of its antiquity.

Taking up the question at his final point—viz., the quotation from Ezekiel, who refers to "Noah, Daniel, and Job," Noah may be regarded as an ancestral personage with the Jews of the captivity; Daniel was an historical co-temporary; Job was not historical or co-temporary, nor even a Jew at all; he must be regarded as a poetical character—*i.e.*, his name is linked to a story. Now, if Ezekiel really knew anything at all about Job, he must have been familiar with the story of his so-called patience; the story of Job's patience would either be substantially the same as our Book of Job, or our Book of Job is founded upon that story. In either case we must conclude that some narrative existed which was then familiar to Ezekiel, for unless we adopt this conclusion, the reference to Job, by Ezekiel, would have been quite unintelligible to his readers.

It is customary to test the antiquity of the Jewish sacred writings by the use of the terms Elohim and Jehovah, as found in them. Acting upon this idea, I formerly sent a communication to the *Jewish Record*, which I make no apology for reproducing here.

It was in reply to Dr Beke, who wrote —"The antiquity of the Book of Job is of several centuries prior to the time of Moses." I replied, that the Book of Job had evidently been built up from an original story of great antiquity, but that, as set in its existing framework, it could not be older than the captivity.

This argument is founded upon an analysis of the names used for the Su-

Digitized by Google

preme Being, in the different parts or divisions of the whole book, thus:

	El or Elohim.	Jehovah.	El-Shaddai.
Introduction, .	11	16	—
Speeches of Job,	45	1	14
,, Eliphaz,	15	—	7
,, Bildad,	6	—	2
,, Zophar,	7	—	1
,, Elihu,	27	—	6
,, God,	7	—	1
Conclusion, . .	—	5	—
Connecting phrases,	—	4	—
Totals,	118	26	31

El or Elohim is the well-known Semitic* name for God, otherwise Allah; El-Shaddai is "the mighty God;" these are words placed in the mouth of Moses, who states, Ex. vi. 3, "by my name Jehovah was I not known." The one case of Jehovah [the LORD] used by Job, is probably a copyist's error.

We thus find that the speeches of the six interlocutors indicate a purely Semitic usage of the greatest antiquity; the introduction is not so ancient; but the conclusion, which narrates Job's restoration to prosperity, drops the ancient form altogether; thus proving it to be the most recent addition to the Scriptural book as we now have it.

These more recent additions point to the writer, known as the *later* Zechariah, who uses the word "Satan" in precisely the same sense.

A. H.

* Semitic or (Shemitic) pertaining to *Shem, a son of Noah.* The reader is directed to the People's Dictionary of the Bible, article "Language," and to Chambers's Encyclopædia, article "Shemitic." Information will also be found in the *Teacher's Manual.*—ED.

THE PENALTY ON NOT ACTING UP TO CONVICTIONS.

IT will often happen in a family, that the husband is the more critical and theological, the wife the more religious and devotional. The man perhaps, before his marriage, has gained a clear perception of the nonsense, to use the mildest term, of the doctrines taught in the church prayers and liturgy. If he had cared more for public worship than he did for the opinion of those among whom he had been brought up, he would have joined the Unitarians. On his marriage, he talks of these matters to his new wife. She does not much disagree with what he says on theology; but, on the other side of the question, she cordially agrees with him when he settles that "We cannot be dissenters." So, as she likes public worship, they go to church together, or he at least sends her, while he stays at home. She regrets at first the loss of his company; but after a time, even prefers going alone, as she thus avoids his half scoffing remarks upon the creeds they have been repeating, and words that they have been listening to. When they have children, they are of course baptized by the clergyman with the sign of the cross, and they accompany their mother on Sundays to church. The mother, while guiding their young minds to religion, becomes gradually a more earnest theologian than she used to be, and the husband begins to find, that in all matters relating to Sunday, to the Bible, to religion in general, he is alone in the house.

This is a case so common that all our readers who have passed middle life must have seen such. One such husband often, enjoying the pleasure of an hour's heretical conversation with a Unitarian friend, will beg him not to repeat the conversation in the presence of his wife. Another, who has known less of Unitarians, while entirely agreeing with the opinions, will say, "But I suppose you don't teach these opinions to your children." Another father will even find himself thought irreligious by his children as they grow up. At the club, and in mixed company, he gets rid of this trouble. In the world at large, among strangers, to be an any-thing-arian is not a bad character: there religious earnestness is what is unpopular. But at home, our husband and father finds himself sent into solitude in regard to one of the most important subjects of thought and conversation; and this trouble he has brought upon himself because he had not the courage in early life to act upon his convictions, and own himself a Unitarian dissenter.

Digitized by Google

CHRIST'S GLORY WITH THE FATHER BEFORE THE WORLD WAS.

IN the beautiful prayer of Christ which is preserved for us in the 17th chapter of John's Gospel, occurs the remarkable petition, at the 5th verse, "And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was." From this passage it is the frequent habit to infer the Deity of the speaker; to reach the tremendous conclusion that he was the Creator of heaven and of earth, the peer of the "King eternal, immortal, and invisible." It should be a sufficient answer to this wild deduction to call attention to the simple fact that Jesus frequently declares in this very chapter that the "glory" of which he speaks was *given* to him by the Almighty. Thus, in verse 1, "Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son"—*i.e.*, bestow glory upon him; in the text, "glorify Thou me," bestow glory upon me;" in verse 22, "the glory which Thou *gavest* me;" and in verse 24, "my glory which Thou hast *given* me." From these reiterated declarations it evidently appears that the "glory" of which Christ speaks (whatever it was), was not his own inherently and of personal right, but had been conferred upon him as a favour and reward by another, and, therefore, an infinitely superior Being. It is at least equally clear that the "glory" which the CREATOR possesses was His own from everlasting, before he called a single sun or world into existence, and while yet He dwelt alone with His adorable perfections. If the FATHER'S glory was thus eternal, and inherent, and infinite; and if Christ's glory was, as he avers so frequently and so solemnly, derived, and therefore finite, and therefore also received in time, between two such Beings there could not exist even the possibility, even the imagination, of *Equality*.

But, if it was not the "glory" of a Deity of which Jesus spake, might it not have been the "glory" of an angel, or of an arch-angel? Impossible; and for this single but all-sufficient reason, that the "glory" he had received from the FATHER, he had voluntarily shared with his Apostles; as he affirms in verse 22—"And the glory which Thou gavest me, *I have given them.*" It is inconceivable that it can have been any angelic or arch-angelic "glory" of which Jesus speaks; for even suppose such to be communicable (which it clearly is not), we know, as a mere matter of fact, that such was never given on earth to the Twelve; and yet their Master *had* shared with them "the glory" (whatever it may have been), which he "had with the Father before the world was."

It might here be asked, Do not these last four words prove, at the very least, that Jesus *existed* "before the world was?" Can he have had "glory" before he existed? Strange as it may at first sight appear, I answer unhesitatingly, Yes! In the Divine Mind, there is no Past, and no Future, but one everlasting and unchangeable Present; so that persons who lived and events which transpired thousands of years ago, and persons who are not to live and events which are not to transpire for thousands of years to come, are equally before its consciousness as are persons living and events transpiring at this precise and individual moment. Hence Paul writes, in Rom. iv. 17, how God "calleth those things which be not as though they were." In perfect accordance with this fact in the Divine metaphysics, the same Apostle speaks, in 2 Timothy i. 9, of God's "purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began;" the meaning of which obviously is, that the Gospel was given through Christ, not actually, but *in the divine purpose*, "before the world began." In like manner Jesus is styled in Rev. xiii. 8, "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world"—that is, "the Lamb slain," not actually, but *in the divine purpose*, "from the foundation of the world." Keeping these passages steadily in view, it seems to me that we are not only warranted in understanding, but even that we are compelled to understand, the "glory" treated of in this article as one which Christ "had with the Father," not actually, but *in the divine purpose*, "before the world was."

What, now, was the "glory" which the

Digitized by Google

FATHER bestowed on Jesus, and which Jesus shared with the Twelve? It was the "glory" of accomplishing the high objects of his mission, and of "finishing the work" which had been assigned to him from on high. It was the "glory" of revealing to the worshippers of innumerable idols of wood, or stone, or metal, the "One living and true God." It was the "glory" of declaring to those who were weighed down by a host of puerile or vicious ceremonies, that "God is a spirit." It was the "glory" of showing, alike to those who thought the Deity was too remote and high to care what befel a race so mean as that of man, and to those who trembled before the idea of a partial, austere, and revengeful sovereign above, that God was indeed the *Father* of every intelligence He has created. It was the "glory" of preaching to those who were conscious of having grievously offended, and knew not whether there was any pardon for their transgressions, and were utterly cast down by a "fearful looking for of judgment," that free forgiveness was in store for all who sincerely and efficaciously repented. It was the "glory" of promising to all the sorrow-stricken, and all the bereaved, and all who have endured wrong in this world, and all who are afraid of death, and all who hungered and thirsted after a higher perfection and a higher bliss than this life supplies, an immortality beyond the grave. In a word, the "glory" which, "before the world was," God had determined eventually to bestow on His beloved, was the glory of proclaiming the Gospel; of seeking and saving them that were lost; of labouring, sorrowing, dying, to promote the noblest, — namely, the moral and spiritual interests of all the human race. This was evidently a "glory" which Jesus had received from the Father; and also a glory which Jesus shared with his Apostles; and was, in my estimation at least, a holier and a truer glory for Christ than merely to have occupied a throne in heaven, how near soever to that of the Supreme, if that throne had been *unwon* by a life of duty and of sacrifice.

R. E. B. MACLELLAN.

A Few of the LAWS Relating to RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS in ENGLAND, Arranged Chronologically.

Continued from last month.

A. D.

1689. The Comprehension Act is rejected, and the Toleration Act passed, 1 W. & M. st. 1, c. 18. This act embraces the Presbyterians, Independants, and Baptists, henceforth known as the Three Denominations, but excludes Roman Catholics and those who impugn the Trinity. Carmarthen College is now founded.

1696. Act passed allowing the solemn affirmation of the Quakers to stand for an oath.

1698. Act for the more effectual suppression of "blasphemy and profaneness," under which offences were included the denial of the Trinity, 8 and 9 Wm. iii. c. 32.

1700. Act to check the growth of Popery, cruelly requiring all Roman Catholics to take an oath against Transubstantiation and the Worship of Saints. This Act is repealed by the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829.

1702. The attempt to bring in a Bill against Occasional Conformity causes violent disputes. Upon this occasion Daniel Defoe writes his ironical work, called The shortest way with the Dissenters.

A. D.

1711. The Act against Occasional Conformity is passed, 10 Anne.

1714. The Schism Bill is brought forward, but frustrated by the death of Queen Anne.

1717. Convocation is silenced. In 1861 the two Houses of Convocation once more assemble for business at Westminster after a cessation of nearly 150 years.

1721. A new Act for the Suppression of Blasphemy and Profaneness is attempted, but is thrown out.

1753. The Act prohibiting foreigners to be naturalised without taking the Lord's Supper is removed in favour of the Jews, but is restored again the next session of Parliament with some precipitation.

1779. Act passed for the relief of dissenting school-masters.

1812. The New Toleration Act passed, repealing the Act against Quakers, the Five-Mile and the Conventicle Acts. Although this Act did not offer liberty of worship to Unitarians, it was understood to be a step thereto. A Unitarian Chapel, the first in Scotland, is opened, by Mr James Yates.

Digitized by Google

A. D.

1813. Wm. Smith's Unitarian Relief Act is passed. A like Act for Ireland was passed four years later.

1828. Final repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts.

1829. The Catholic Emancipation Act passed. Five Roman Catholic Peers immediately take their seats into the House of Lords.

1834. The Reform Bill is passed.

1836. The Dissenters' Marriage Act and the Dissenters' Registers Acts passed.

1844. The Dissenters' Chapels Bill passed.

1858. Act passed enabling the Jews to sit in Parliament. Baron Rothschild takes his seat as a member of the House of Commons, being sworn on the Old Testament.

1868. Church Rates abolished. Public executions abolished.

1869. Act passed for the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. This church presently drops the use of the Athanasian Creed.

1871. University Tests Abolition Bill passed.

Thus, through a period of nearly five hundred years we follow the path of that independence of conscience which has always prevented a large part of our countrymen from conforming to a religion laid down for them by Act of Parliament, and trace first the gradual growth of bigotry and persecution, and presently a happy relaxation of tyranny under the influence of enlightenment and civilization, until step by step every disability is removed from before dissenters, and we can look around to-day in wonder and gratitude that there is now hardly anything left to be desired for a complete religious toleration in England, and the time of religious equality seems fast approaching.

May we be allowed to express the wish that some one of our Unitarian friends who is familiar with the law, and has the original documents within his reach, will one day undertake the task of drawing up a fuller and more accurate list of these statutes, giving to each one in its turn a chapter in explanation of the causes that gave rise to it, and of the effects it produced, and enabling us to put into the hands of our young people something like a history of this most instructive subject.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

SECULAR TEACHING.

THERE is little difference of opinion amongst the members of the Unitarian denomination respecting the importance of giving to the young the benefit of knowledge, and, as far as possible, ideas of God, and the religious life. We believe, however, the means used to such really noble ends are in a great measure unproductive. Some success attends the general efforts to impart the elements of common knowledge. There is a plain matter of fact work in teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic, to boys and girls who, through the carelessness or ignorance of their parents, have not enjoyed the benefit of a day school, and who now are engaged in work. This class exists in, we suppose, all Unitarian schools; hence the constant necessity of giving so-called secular teaching. We notice a disposition on the part of some of the members of our Sunday School Associations to shirk this portion of Unitarian Sunday School work. The bright prospect of the future seems to have dazzled the eyes, and to have deadened the sensibilities of teachers to the present facts of the case of thousands of children, who ought not to be allowed to grow up in ignorance, as they are now doing. We would press this upon the attention of our readers who are interested in Christian work.

RELIGIOUS TEACHING.

In what we have written of the great importance of taking due means to provide for the wants of the ignorant, in respect to ordinary secular knowledge, we do not for one moment forget that religious influences must be brought to bear also upon the young. This is also attempted in our Sunday Schools, and because it is understood that religious teaching is in some way communicated: the children of the members of the congregation (usually, we regret to have to remark, only the poorer of them) who have sometimes a better acquaintance with arithmetic, and similar branches, than their teachers, attend the Sunday School. It is clearly a waste of time to give such, at the same time with boys and girls who have been neglected in their education, lessons which they are learning better in their day schools. The

Digitized by Google

parents of these children send them not for secular knowledge, except so far as that relates to the geography and natural history of the Bible; and it must be borne in mind that to drill children in the geography of Palestine, or the nature of the olive, or the rose, or the manners of the ancient Hebrews, may result in little, if anything, more than giving a knowledge of interesting facts, certainly not to be despised, but still, which must not be regarded as necessarily religious teaching.

RELIGIOUS MEETING FOR THE YOUNG.

We have, then, these two classes of children in our schools—some of them need secular instruction, some of them, so far as the Sunday School is concerned, do not. The whole of the children may be said to need religious instruction, and for that purpose they may be safely classed, irrespective of intellectual attainment, in accordance with their ages. Our plan is to divide the school, and even divide the teachers. We would widen the classes for religious culture so as to include the children of the congregation. We must then determine the hour for the gathering of the distinctively religious meeting of the young, which would differ from the ordinary worship of the church mainly in several teachers being engaged in bringing forcibly before the minds of the members a knowledge of Christianity. No doubt there is a secular side to this, inasmuch as it is the duty of a Unitarian to expose the erroneous notions which are popular with respect to the nature and character of God and his relation to mankind. The hour for this meeting of course would depend upon circumstances. In the Glasgow Unitarian Church, where there is a meeting of this kind, the hour is about one o'clock. The Scottish people being indifferent as to the Sunday's dinner makes this hour possible. In England it would be inconvenient. There is the time before the morning service, and the afternoon or evening. In Scotland very many of the Sunday Schools meet at about six o'clock. In chapels where there is an afternoon service this might be found suitable in England. The minister, if possible, should be the superintendent, because he would obtain the attendance of some who, perhaps, otherwise would not come. An important consideration is the length of time such a meeting for the young should occupy. We should limit it to an hour and a half. Persons who now do nothing in Sunday School work, we are convinced, would find a pleasant means of doing good in this meeting of the young.

A SECULAR TEACHER NEEDED.

The department for teaching secular knowledge should be, if possible, placed in the hands of an efficient teacher, and no person should be invited who is getting instruction through the week. Let the secular department meet at nine o'clock, and devote an hour and a half to making the best possible use of the time. But the attendants at this should not be compelled to be present at the services of the chapel. Our Sunday School managers make a serious mistake where they compel the children who have been in the School to be present at the service intended only for adults. We need not wonder at losing our elder scholars when we have abused the period when we had the power to force them to endure that in which they would take no interest. If the children desire to attend chapel let them do so, but take care and do not force them.

We have thus indicated the direction in which a change may be made in our Sunday School management, which would tend to bring in teachers who now stand aloof, and the children would, we firmly believe, receive greater benefit.

OUR QUESTIONS ON THE BIBLE.

Who are the unnamed persons mentioned in the following passages?

1. **Lament. iv. 20: The breath of our nostrils; the anointed of the Lord was taken in their pits.**
2. **Joel ii. 14: Who knoweth if he will return and repent, and leave a blessing behind him, even a meal-offering and a drink-offering unto Jehovah your God?**
3. **Jeremiah xxii. 10: Weep not for the dead, neither bemoan him; but weep sore for him that goeth away, for he shall return no more, nor see his native country.**
4. **Isaiah xlvi. 2; Calling a ravenous bird from the east; the man that executeth my counsel from a far country.**
5. **Jeremiah l. 44: Behold he shall come up like a lion from the swelling of the Jordan unto the habitation of the strong.**
6. **Zechariah xi. 8: Three shepherds also I cut off in one month, and my soul loathed them, and their soul also abhored me.**

Digitized by Google

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

FIFTH LESSON.

On the Cases of Nouns.

WE begin with a Table of Noun-Endings for our Pupils to keep for constant reference, but beg them also to learn the declensions in their Grammars, where the whole Nouns are given.

Noun-Endings—The Three Declensions.

SINGULAR.

		Nom.	Gen.	Dat.	Acc.	Voc.
1st,	fem.	η	ης	ῃ	ην	η
		α	ης	ῃ	αν	α
		α	ας	ᾳ	αν	α
	mas.	ας	ου or α	ᾳ	αν	α
		ης	ου	ῃ	ην	α or η
2d,	m. & f.	ος	ου	ῳ	ον	ε
	n.	ον	ου	ῳ	ον	ον
	m. & f.	ως	ω	ῳ	ων	ως
	n.	ων	ω	ῳ	ων	ων
3d,		α or ι υ or ς ν or ρ	ος εως ους	ι ᾳ	α or η like ν or ω the Nom.	

PLURAL.

1st,	αι	αων & ων	αις	ας	αι
2d,	οι	ων	οις	ους	οι
	α	ων	οις	α	α
	ῳ	ων	ῳς	ως	ῳ
	ω	ων	ῳς	ω	ω
3d,	α ες or εις or η ης	ων	σι	ας or α εις or η	ες or α

DUAL.

	Nom. & Acc.	Gen. & Dat.
1st,	α	αιν
2d,	ω	οιν
	ω	ῳν
3d,	ε or η	οιν
	α	ῳν

When in English we want to express,

The good man bringeth forth good [things]

we show it is the *man* that *brings* by putting the word *man* before the verb, and we say the noun *man* is in the Nominative case. And we show what it is he brings forth by putting *good* [*things*] after the verb, and we say *good* [*things*] is in the Objective or Accusative case.

But in Greek (as in Latin) they put different final letters to a noun according to which case it is in. And they do not always keep that order of words, but depend on the final letters to show the meaning. Changing these final letters is called declining a noun.

Greek Nouns have not only a different ending for the various cases, but also different nouns have different sets of endings; and are sorted accordingly into several declensions. Which we will now examine on the table.

Notice—that the 3d Declension increases in the Genitive case, but so variously that our short Table cannot show it all—that all Nom. and Voc. cases are generally alike; and in the Neuter, Nom. Acc. and Voc. are all alike (as in Latin);—that the Genitive Plural is ων like the Article;—that the Dative Singular has the iota subscripta, except in the 3d declension, where ι is there not underneath;—that the Accusative Singular ends with ν preceeded by a vowel, except in the 3d declension.

Matthew xii. 34-36.

1 Εκ γαρ του περισσευματος της καρδιας
out for of the over-flow of the heart
2 το στομα λαλει. Ὁ αγαθος ανθρωπος
the mouth speaketh. The good man
3 εκ του αγαθου θησαυρου εκβαλλει
from the good treasure bringeth out
4 τα αγαθα· και ὁ πονηρος ανθρωπος
the good; and the wicked man
5 εκ του πονηρου θησαυρου εκβαλλει
from the evil treasure bringeth out
6 πονηρα. Λεγω δε ὑμιν, ὁτι παν
evil. I say, And to you, that every
7 ῥημα αργον, ὁ εαν λαλησωσιν οἱ
word idle, which if shall speak the
8 ανθρωποι, αποδωσουσι περι αυτου
men, they shall give up about it
9 λογον εν ἡμερᾳ κρισεως.
an account in a day of judgment.

Digitized by Google

Notice that ὁ on line 7 is not the Article, but the neuter nominative of the relative pronoun ὅς, ἥ, ὁ *who*. And it is by the context we have to decide which it is.

Many of our pupils must be so forward now, they should be thinking of a dictionary. Schrevelius' Greek and English Lexicon is a very good one, and can be had second-hand for two or three shillings. Do not get a little dictionary; it does not give help enough.

A Good Method for Distributing Unitarian Publications.

We believe Unitarian periodicals and books are often neglected, not from want of means to take them, but from want of thought that the help of each person is valuable. If the members of Unitarian Churches would each devote a small sum per week to a Book Fund, a market would be created which would relieve those who publish from loss.

A minister has kindly forwarded us an account of the method used in his own congregation to do justice to Unitarian publications.

In reply to your inquiry as to the plan of our Book Club, it is so simple as hardly to deserve the dignity of its name, or of your attention. During the fourteen years I have been minister here, one part of my programme has always been to encourage the young people to supply themselves with healthy religious literature, but only in a desultory way. Still, many hundreds of Unitarian works have been distributed; and I rejoice to see them on the shelves of those who are now in homes of their own, but who procured the books from me when they were boys and girls in the Sunday School. When Dr Beard's "Reasons for being a Unitarian" were published—of which we sold 80, and again when Channing's works came out—of which we sold 180—I regretted that the good done, and which had been effected by diligent canvassing, should cease with the occasion, and that we could not have the names of our customers on a permanent list, and that some method more regular than had hitherto been adopted could not be devised to save labour in the future, for, as already intimated, many of the young folk paid by instalments. The issue of Dr Priestley's "Corruptions," and Dr Smith's "Bible and the Popular Theology," deepened this regret; and at the beginning of this year, when the *Missionary* was announced, we felt that, if our various periodicals, and the occasional publications of the "British and Foreign," were to have justice done to them, we must adopt some systematic plan—establish, in fact, a Book Store, in a small way. Besides, there was consideration of self-interest, that, if a certain number of copies could be disposed of, books could be had at a cheaper rate, and as some one had to take all the trouble of a bookseller,—to collect money, and distribute books and magazines—we thought it was only just that we should get the usual discount. In a large town any one can get 20 or 25 per cent. off books as they can 50 or more off music, but not in a small town. So we have established a CLUB,—no member to pay less than one penny weekly, but as much more as he likes—which is simply a Bookselling Association, the profits of which will be divided among the members, not in money, but books. If a member takes in the *Missionary*, the cost of it is deducted from his share, and so with the *Freeman*, *Sunday Stories*, and *Teacher's Manual*. So, if he wants a volume, the cost is deducted, but he is allowed the "large town discount." The members are encouraged of course to take in Unitarian magazines and buy Unitarian books; but there is no compulsion, each one decides for himself how he will take out his share. Hitherto only a few music books and Eliza Cook's poems have been asked for; a few will be getting Greek Grammars by and bye, when they have mustered up courage to study the Greek New Testament, which they are trying to do. We have 40 members, chiefly elder scholars of both sexes. No effort has been made as yet to introduce the plan into the general congregation. The payments are collected at the evening classes on Tuesdays and Saturdays, and some few in the Sunday School itself. A steward is appointed to collect, and the school treasurer procures and distributes the magazines and books. The advantage of our plan is, that 40 persons, elder scholars, or young teachers, have pledged themselves to spend at least from four to five shillings a year in solid literature—which means, reckoning the profit of sales to non-members, more than six shilling's worth of Unitarian magazines and books in return.

O. J.

THE BRITISH & FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

MEETINGS AT WHITSUNTIDE.

The Inquirer is authorised to state that, in addition to our eloquent friend Pasteur Coquerel, of Paris, there will be present one of the most valuable and estimable ministers of our American Churches, the Rev. Charles Lowe, late secretary of the American Unitarian Association. The Protestant Association of Germany will be represented by Baron von Holtzendorf of Berlin, and he may be accompanied by Dr Manchoul of Bremen. The Baron is a Professor of Law of high standing, with great influence in Germany.

We certainly have every prospect of interesting meetings in London this year.

Digitized by Google

REVIEW.

A Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leviticus, Part 2. Longmans. Dr Kalisch.

This is the second of two large volumes, containing the Book of Leviticus in Hebrew and English, together with notes and learned dissertations on the Jewish Laws, relating to the priesthood and sacrifices, and also on the sacrifices among the Pagan nations of antiquity, so far as these throw light on those of the Jews. Dr Kalisch discusses these questions without religious prejudices, and comes to the conclusion that the Book of Leviticus is altogether of a late date, and written long after the Book of Deuteronomy, which belongs to King Josiah's reign. In this very novel opinion the *Inquirer*, for March 30, agrees with the learned author; and on this subject we wish to say a few words.

Dr Kalisch shows that Leviticus contains many enactments, relating to morals and civilization, far more humane and spiritual, than Deuteronomy, and also enactments relating to the priesthood and the sacrifices, far more rigid and ceremonial than the other book; and thinks that, on both these accounts, this book is to be judged the more modern. We, on the other hand, would separate this Book of Leviticus into two parts; and we consider the ceremonial laws at the beginning to be as much older than Deuteronomy as the moral laws at the end are more modern. Thus we agree with Dr Kalisch and his friendly critic about the moral laws, and differ with them about the date of the ceremonial laws.

The reader will observe that the ceremonial portions of Leviticus, in chapters i. xvii., xxi., and xxii., are addressed to the priests, the Sons of Aaron, while the moral laws are addressed to the people of Israel. Among the moral laws we find distinct mention of the nation's return from the captivity in Babylon, which took place B.C. 537. This gives us a date, Dr Kalisch thinks, for the whole book; we think for a part of it only. The question, for the rest of the book, turns upon when in the nation's history did the priesthood claim the greatest power over men's minds, and put forth with approval these minute laws relating to sins, and offerings, and articles of food for the whole people, and relating to gifts to the priests, and the priests' duties and ranks. We say that this was about the years B.C. 850, 750, when the nation was in prosperity, and Jerusalem in every respect a flourishing and wealthy capital. Let us turn for a moment to the history.

David built the altar on Mount Moriah, and established the Levites there. Solomon built the temple and introduced yet more costly sacrifices. Jehoshaphat employed the priests to teach the people the law, and authorised them to act as judges, adding thereby much to their importance, and giving to them civil power. When Queen Athaliah usurped the throne, the priests were strong enough to depose her, and put her to death, and to put up a child, a puppet of their own, as king; and they governed the kingdom despotically till he came to manhood, and threw off their yoke. Uzziah reigned in obedience to the priests, who were so strong that when he claimed to act himself as priest, as David and Solomon had done, and to burn incense in the House of Jehovah, they declared him a leper, as the Book of Leviticus authorizes, and as such, put him in confinement for the rest of his life. Here, then, we have the priesthood in Jerusalem at the height of its power; and to this century, from the reign of Jehoshaphat to the reign of Uzziah, we would give the composition of the ceremonial laws in Leviticus and Numbers.

After this time the Prophetical writings came into existence. First Isaiah and then Jeremiah declare sacrifices to be less pleasing to God than goodness. Then, the Book of Deuteronomy is written with its lessened value for the ceremonial laws; and the nation is shortly afterwards carried into captivity. Now, it is true that on the return from captivity, and in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, we meet with an increase of narrow bigotry, of sabbatical strictness, in the priests, a falling off in short from the more enlightened views of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Deuteronomy; but the oppressed and poverty-stricken state of the nation will by no means allow us to suppose that directions for the costly sacrifices, contained in the Books of Leviticus and Numbers, belong to this unhappy period. We hold, in short, against Dr Kalisch, that the earlier and ceremonial portion of Leviticus was written about a century and a half or two centuries before the captivity, while the later, the moral portion of the book, was written about the same length of time after the captivity. S. S.

EAST LANCASHIRE UNITARIAN MISSION

Annual Report for the year 1871.

The work of this Mission is directed to the support of Unitarian Christian Worship in Accrington, Astley, Bolton (Commission Street), Burnley, Heap Bridge, Heywood, Rawtenstall, Rochdale (Clover Street.) A new feature appears in the report—the giving of a table by which we learn the number of members at each of the assisted congregations, the average attendance of adults, the number of Sunday scholars, and the amount raised during the past year. The total—members, 585; attendance, 372; Sunday scholars, 1051; amount raised, £681.

We presume the amount raised is the sum contributed by members of the congregations. The remark respecting one congregation in the visitors' report, that "some generous friends at Bury have aided the funds," seems inconsistent with this view. If such aid is included in the statement of money raised, it helps to make other congregations appear at a disadvantage, who have no such neighbours to assist them We are struck with the large number of Sunday scholars, compared with the adult members. These Sunday scholars should ultimately become members, and so, in five years, double the present number; but we fear this result will not be attained, even allowing for the changes which take away the elder scholars into other towns Our Teachers ought to be more alive to the necessity of planting in the minds of the young the principles of Unitarian Christianity.

The whole of the Mission-Stations have been visited since Jan. 1, 1872. All have ministers except Heap Bridge, which is attended to by the Rev. J. Fox of Heywood and Rev. John Wright, B.A., of Bury. Eight years ago, we believe, only Rochdale had a settled minister.

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

No. 6. JUNE 1872. PRICE 1D.

ORTHODOX DOCTRINES DENIED BY UNITARIANS.

By the Rev. JOHN WRIGHT, B.A., Bury.

No. 3.—THE EXISTENCE OF THE DEVIL.

EVERY orthodox Christian professes to believe in the existence and activity of an evil spirit, called the Devil. It is nevertheless difficult to find any authoritative statement of the precise orthodox doctrine on the subject. The general popular feeling is so far from being serious in regard to it, that the Devil is introduced in poems, plays, and fables, and often represented in a ludicrous form. The most satisfactory method of treating the doctrine is to give a brief historical sketch of its rise and progress.

Those books of the Old Testament which are generally acknowledged to be the most ancient, contain no mention of a malignant personal author of evil. The early religion of the Jews attributed all things to God as their source, and taught that good and evil, light and darkness, alike proceed from the decrees of his Wisdom. The few passages, in those oldest parts of the Bible, in which the word "devils" occurs, refer to false Gods, who had no existence except in the superstitions of their worshippers. At the time of the captivity, the Jews were brought in contact with the Chaldean and Persian mythologies, and borrowed thence some of the phrases and ideas relating to the origin of evil. The Persians believed in two great spirits, one good and the other evil, waging a perpetual warfare. And it was from the influence of this doctrine on the Hebrews that they began to speak of Satan (the adversary) as the origin of moral evil. A modification of this view is seen in the book of Job, though Satan is there described as the servant and instrument rather than the enemy of God. He is also spoken of *I. Chron. xxi.* 1, and this is one of the proofs of the comparatively late period when Chronicles was written. Thus grew up the state of belief that existed among the Jews, in the time of Christ, when Satan was spoken of as the author of evil, and was believed to be the leader of a band of wicked spirits. The Greek word in the New Testament properly translated Devil, corresponds in meaning to the Hebrew word Satan, signifying adversary. That it was often used figuratively is shown by the facts, that Christ called Peter "Satan," and said to his Apostles, "one of you is a Devil." But there is another word in the New Testament translated "devil," which would be more correctly "demon." The Jews attributed diseases, especially epilepsy and madness, to the presence in those afflicted, of the spirits of wicked dead men, and called these spirits "demons." When the diseases were cured, they said "the demon is cast out." Christ and his apostles made use of this popular phraseology, but that

Digitized by Google

does not prove that the idea it expressed was true, and it is totally contradicted by the increased medical knowledge of modern days.

When Christianity began to spread among heathen nations, the Hebrew notion as to evil spirits was, to some extent, spread with it, but was modified and enlarged by the addition of many national and local superstitions. The old heathen Gods were in some cases identified in men's minds with the Devil. From one of them he got the cloven hoof and tail, from another the horns, popularly attributed to him. Monkish legends, dwelling on ancient fables and allegories, devised many a story of his doings, his victories or defeats. The genuis of Milton gave a new character to the popular idea, representing Satan as possessing a tragic grandeur, and putting into shape much that was before vague in the notions concerning him. Modern theology, attempting to construct an accordant theory, identified, as one and the same being, the serpent in *Gen. iii.* (though the passage itself says nothing of its being anything but a serpent), the Satan of Job (though he is not represented as banished from heaven), the personification of evil in various parts of the Bible (though the expressions are often plainly figurative), the serpent, dragon, &c., spoken of in the allegories of the book of Revelation. The existence of such a Being, Unitarians deny.

1. If there is a Devil, he is not self-existent, but has been created by God. The Creator, at the time He formed him, must have foreseen that he would be the source of mischief and pain, and would, in many instances, thwart the designs of Infinite Love. How then can we believe that the All-wise and All-good would call into existence a creature of unbounded malignity, and would allow him to continue his course of tempting, misleading, and destroying mankind? Such an existence would be opposed either to the Power or the Love of God. If He *cannot* conquer and destroy the Devil, He is not Omnipotent; if He can, but *will not*, He is not full of tender mercy to his human family.

2. The orthodox teachings about the Devil are full of contradictions. He is spoken of as fallen from heaven, but yet abounding in power on earth; the greatest of offenders against God, and yet entrusted with the supremacy of Hell; waging war with the Infinite One, and yet sometimes victorious; the author of all our evil thoughts and deeds, and yet deriving pleasure instead of receiving punishment, as the consequence of his corruption of mankind; the creature, yet the enemy of God. If the doctrine of original sin be true, man is bad enough in himself, and there needs no Devil to account for his wickedness. If the doctrine of the atonement be true, the Devil was stronger than God, for he obliged God himself to endure infinite suffering. If the doctrine of eternal torments be true, the Devil obtains the full gratification of his desires in the case of a large portion of the human race. Yet in spite of all this, Satan is represented as supremely miserable.

3. To suppose that the Devil can influence human hearts and minds, destroys our belief in Divine providence, and at the same time weakens our sense of individual responsibility. Men call their wicked propensities the suggestions of Satan, and excuse their evil conduct on the ground that he tempted them. Thus their consciences are lulled and their hearts are hardened. Hence have sprung the delusions and superstitions of witchcraft, the fancied combats of the fanatic with a personal spiritual foe, and the gloom and even madness resulting from imaginary terrors. If indeed a man realises to himself the notion, that an invisible being of greatest malignity is ever at his side, ready to whisper evil suggestions in his ear, and by every means to ruin his soul, how can he have the heart to keep on struggling to do right, how can he ever know peace or joy?

4. The belief in the Devil is inconsistent with the teachings of Scripture. The sinner is there spoken of as entirely responsible for his sins; he is warned against his moral dangers, and exhorted to conquer temptation.

We are told in Scripture that men are tempted by their own lusts, are called on to conquer their appetites and passions, are attacked by moral evil not by a personal tempter. The passages of Scripture in which the word Devil occurs may all be explained as either expressing a popular superstition, or being simply figurative. Wherever the true translation is not "demon," referring to a diseased person (as *Matt. ix.* 32), it might in every instance be rendered "enemy," or "accuser,"

Digitized by Google

or "slanderer;" it describes no one specific person, but an opposer of any kind.

Thus Satan means, *Rom. xvi.* 20, the persecutors of the Roman converts; *I. Cor. v.* 5, excommunication from the Church; *II. Cor. ii.* 11, the personal opponent of Paul; *II. Cor. xii.* 7, bodily infirmity. So in the gospels, devil or some similar word means, *Matt. xiii.* 19, human enemies of the gospel; *John vi.* 70, Judas Iscariot. Dr. Bushnell says: "Satan or the Devil, taken in the singular, is not the name of any particular person, neither is it a personation merely of temptation or impersonal evil, but the name is one taken up by the imagination to designate or embody, in a conception the mind can most easily wield, the all or total of bad minds and powers."

But it is said in reply—"How can you account for sin, if there is no Devil? Does God cause sin? It makes no difference whether God permits sin, or permits the Devil to cause sin. Any way, you must refer everything ultimately to the Divine will. There can be no doubt that there is evil in the world, and that God permits its existence, because He could, if He thought fit, put an end to it. The reason He permits it, is to give his children the opportunity of using their powers to resist and conquer it, that thus they may grow strong. But why should we suppose that this evil is centred in a person? How does it help in explaining the existence of sin, to suppose a malignant spirit ever at work causing it? The personification of evil was natural to the imaginative people of the East, and is serviceable to the poet, but it needs substantial proof before it can be received as a doctrine of theology. If we reject it, we shall feel as a consequence that evil itself is our great enemy; that sin has to be struggled against and temptation conquered, as the only method by which we can gain spiritual peace; and that if we fail in the contest, we have only ourselves to blame.

EASTERN MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.

THE Arabic-speaking nations, including the Jews, have always had stronger religious feelings, a greater trust in God's over-ruling care, and a firmer belief in the value of prayer, than we western people of Europe seem to have. This is clearly shown in the Bible, and is a chief reason for our valuing the Hebrew writings. Thus, an Arab never passes by a man digging in his garden, or working in his field, without cheering him with the wish that God may bless his work, unless he thinks him a wicked man. Then, of course, he is silent, as the Psalmist says of the wicked—

> Neither do they that pass by say,
> "May the blessing of Jehovah be upon you;
> We bless you in the name Jehovah."

And very nearly the same importance was, in some cases, allowed to a curse as to a blessing. Thus, in Numbers xxiii., Balak asks Balaam to curse Israel for him, not doubting but the curse would have the wished-for effect. But, as experience showed that ill-natured people did not possess that power of injuring their neighbours, the Proverbs (xxvi. 2) declares,

> As a sparrow in wandering, as a swallow in flying, so a wanton curse shall not reach its end.

After the return of the Jews from the captivity in Babylon, among other signs of refinement in civilization, we note a habit of avoiding indelicate, coarse, and rude words, and thus they sometimes used the word "Bless," when they meant "Curse," trusting that the rest of the sentence, or the tone of voice, would make the meaning known. So Job's wife, in her foolish impatience, advises Job to "bless God, and die," meaning "curse God," as we translate it. And the Proverbs (xxvii. 14) justly remarks that the blame of cursing is by no means lessened by any such quibbling change of the word, and

> He that blesseth his neighbour with a loud voice,
> Rising early in the morning,
> It shall be counted a curse to him.

Strange as this custom of using a wrong word may appear, it is, unfortunately, not quite unknown among ourselves, as shown in the foolish expression, "May I be blessed if I do not do so and so," where the meaning of the word "Bless" is only too clear.

Digitized by Google

THE DEITY OF JESUS.

Did Jesus use presumptuous language if he were no other than man?

IN reply to my arguments in reference to his "Deity of Jesus Christ," which appeared in April's issue of this Journal, the Rev. Joshua Priestley has written me a letter filled with a kindly Christian spirit, containing an additional reason for his conclusions. He says:—

"With much of what you say I cordially agree. But the point I intend the extract you quote to present is untouched by you. What speaker but Jesus Christ makes himself "the representative of humanity?" Neither Moses, nor David, nor Paul, nor any other prophet or teacher mentioned in scripture did so. Were we to hear any speaker assuming such a position for himself, would he excite any feeling less than disgust in us? Jesus seems to me, from this very declaration, to be other than a modest man, or more than a man?"

A very few words, I think, will serve to remove this not very uncommon difficulty. Of course, if conscious presumption, or unconscious vanity, could be proved against Jesus, it would seriously detract from him as the highest illustration of spiritual virtue, and as the best exemplar of the religious life, and so, by his life and character, as the inspirer of divine emulation in man. For presumption, though capable of existing along with great intellectual power, and some few virtues, is the setting up of self above law and right, if not against God Himself, the source of law and right. But I deny the deduction which the sceptic and the orthodox man alike draw from the language which Jesus used on certain occasions, unless he was more than man. It was the function of his office as Messiah, not his nature as a being, that was implicated in the language referred to. And if no other scripture character made himself "the representative of humanity," it was because not one of them believed himself to be the Messiah in the sense in which Jesus did, or they would have done so as freely as he did. Official language is, or ought to be, impersonal, though spoken in the name of persons. Indeed, whenever the matter is rightly understood, the authority of law, or of universal principles, is always intended, not the authority of an individual, inherent in, and native to, that individual when official language is used. Such distinctions are found in every language —in our own for instance. Our Queen uses language of an import, were it once understood in a personal sense, would be repudiated and put aside with indignant protest by this whole nation of Great Britain and Ireland. But it is not so understood when used, nor is it meant in a personal sense. And yet, did any other woman in the realm use such language, she would be set down as insane; or she would be laughed at as silly; or she would be denounced as the most presumptuous creature in existence. But why is it not so with Queen Victoria? Because she speaks, not in her individual person as a woman, but in her capacity as a queen. The law is monarch in Britian. The Queen reigns, she does not rule. But every governmental act is transacted in her name. And why? Because she is delegated by the people of this realm with authority to execute the laws they rule themselves by. Therefore, though she has not a different nature, nor less a subject to the law than others, she speaks with a different emphasis, and uses different pronouns,—the language of official life. Thus, though no other woman uses the language, it does not indicate "other than a modest woman, or more than a woman." And it should be further borne in mind that in the East, from which the Bible and its idioms come, official persons received the very loftiest titles. The people were used to hear their monarchs spoken of as the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; and again and again were their official designations taken as descriptive of their nature.

Now, the Messiah among the Hebrews was believed to unite in himself the functions of the three great classes of officers and servants of their theocracy,—the king, the priest, and the prophet,— terms symbolising far higher functions of authority over men, and intimacy with the mind and

Digitized by Google

will of Jehovah, than we who live in western lands and modern times are disposed to allow. Hence language, which would have been presumptuous in others, was appropriate and modest on the lips of Jesus, who believed himself to be the Messiah, though no other than truly and strictly man in nature.

Mr Priestley further says:—

"Again, he represents himself as *the King*—the arbiter of the destinies of the entire human race. With what propriety could he do that were he a man only?"

Though I fail to see proof of this statement, yet whatever power he believed himself possessed of, be it little or much, it was not inherent in him, it was not primarily his own,—he declared that it was delegated to him by the God and Father of all men, for the purpose of furthering His own wise providential ends. And this power or authority which had a beginning, the scripture states is also to come to an end. (1 Cor. xv. 28.) That he had received whatever he possessed from God was the belief of Jesus himself, a belief shared by his apostles. Thus John declares (John v. 27) that the Father "*hath given him authority* to execute judgment, because he is the son of man"—that is, because he held the office of Messiah. Peter states (Acts x. 42) "it is he who was *ordained of God* to judge both living and dead." Paul, preaching the Gospel to the Athenians from the Bema on Marr's Hill (Acts xvii. 30-31), proclaims that the times of ignorance God overlooked, "but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent, because he hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world righteously *by a man whom He hath appointed.*" And Jesus himself makes the declaration (Matt. xxviii. 18), fatal to all presumptions of primary and inherent power: "All authority *is given to me* in heaven and on earth." Nay, we have the very reason given us why he received the Messiahship (Heb. i. 9), "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated inquity; *therefore* God, thy God, hath anointed thee with oil of gladness above thy fellows."

However lofty the position, or great the authority Jesus possessed then, he had them delegated to him by one greater than himself (John xiv. 28.) While his belief in the possession of these powers, his consciousness of Messiahship, relieves him as a human being from the orthodox charge of being "less than a man" in the use of the language of spiritual authority, the fact and the acknowledgment of the derivation of this authority from One mightier, wiser, and superior in goodness to himself (Matt. xix. 17), on whom he depended, and without whom he could do nothing (John v. 30), accounts for his humility, his piety, and his prayers.

I trust Mr Priestley will acknowledge that I have now tried to meet his "point," and that I have "touched" it on his own lines of entrenchment—in the letter of the New Testament itself,—whether to his satisfaction is altogether another thing.

I cannot do better than conclude this note in the beautiful and Christian words with which my friend closes his letter to me, He says:—"The longer I live the more fully does the conviction seize me that love to God—supreme love—is the pith and essence of His requirement of us. I wish to cultivate more and more of that; and I believe that the more of that we get, we shall become at once more teachable, and less harsh towards those who differ from us." Every Unitarian will say Amen to that. For it is the essential principle of our church—as its basis is religious not theological. We differ from other churches principally because, not that they repudiate this principle, but because other things are added to it, until they pile up a burden on conscience and reason which no free soul can bear.

WILLIAM MITCHELL.

Accrington, April 15, 1872.

If there be any section of the Nonconformist world which has fought in the vanguard of civil and religious liberty, it is the Unitarians.—*Dean Stanley.*

What is faith? Not an opinion, nor any number of opinions put together, be they ever so true. A string of opinions is no more Christian faith than a string of beads is Christian holiness.—*Wesley.*

Everywhere I am bereaved of meeting God in my brother, because he has shut his own temple doors, and recites fables merely of his brother's, or his brother's brother's God.—*Emerson—Self-Reliance.*

The fact is certainly a remarkable one, that Scripture nowhere expressly speaks either of Christ as reconciling God, or of God as being reconciled to us (the nearest approach being supposed to be the "I am pacified," in Ezekiel xvi. 63.)—*Rev. L. D. F. Salmond in Evangel. Review, July* 1871.

Digitized by Google

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

GOD'S way of making man just finds clear and emphatic utterance from the lips of Jesus and the pen of Paul. Before adverting to these supreme authorities, I may for a moment look at the same light as it shone in the comparatively dark place of the Hebrew Church. The prophet Isaiah (v. 23) pronounces a woe on those "who justify the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him." Yet, what else does the common idea of justification, which makes God disown the value of good works, and acquit the sinner in consideration of his belief in the atoning efficacy of the blood of Christ? In other words, guilt as guilt may be removed by assenting to a theological theory, of which Jesus knew nothing, and which God in his providence is now rapidly consigning to everlasting oblivion. No wonder, when so long ago as the days of the prophet Ezekiel, he had declared to the world, as a fundamental principle of his rule on earth, and in opposition to the then, as now, popular falsity of birth-sin, or sin transmitted from parent to child —viz., "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge;"—had, I say, declared this: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die; but if a man is just, and doeth that which is lawful and right, and hath not oppressed any, but hath restored to the debtor his pledge, hath spoiled none by violence, hath given of his bread to the hungry, and hath covered the naked with a garment, he is just, and he shall surely live, saith the Lord God; the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Here is the everlasting law which declares, "Every man shall bear his own burden." (Gal. vi. 5.) The operation of this just, righteous, and necessary enactment is supplemented and qualified by the hand of mercy, even under the Old Covenant, for Ezekiel continues—"But if the wicked will turn from his sins and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die; have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God, and not that he should return from his ways and live?" (Ezek. xviii.) The ground of this placability lies in God's "merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant goodness" (Exodus xxxiv. 6), so that, as "his mercy endureth for ever" (Ps. cvii. 1), "he ever waiteth to be gracious." (Isaiah xxx.)

It would be easy to carry this system of loving-kindness farther from the testimonies of the older Scriptures, but I hasten on to the New Covenant. In its essence, the religion of Jesus is one of tender pity and active succour. It is all said, when he himself declares, "The Son of Man is come to seek and save that which was lost." (Luke xix. 10.) Yes, to seek and to save is the mission and the work of Christ. Consequently, to seek and to save is the aim and tendency of God in his Providence. The truth is beautifully and impressively pictured in the parable of "The Prodigal Son." Repeatedly does the grand and all-important verity drop from the loving and tender lips of Christ. You hear it when he confounded the grey-beards that brought before him the women taken in adultery, and whom he cured, while he dismissed the guilty woman herself with these words —"Hath no man condemned thee?" "No man, Lord." "Neither do I condemn thee: go and sin no more." (John viii. 1-11.) You hear it also in the words which he spake of and to the woman "which was a sinner," and who paid him, while at table, the affectionate homage of washing his feet with tears, and wiping them with the hairs of her head:—"Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much; and he said unto her, 'Thy sins are forgiven; Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace.'" (Luke vii. 36-50.) And yet, that faith was not in the atoning blood of Christ, but loving confidingness in one whom she knew to be alike able and willing to feel for her and with her, and to express his sympathy in merciful succour.

It is this readiness to forgive, this readiness to aid, this fostering goodness which makes the Gospel "glad tidings of great joy unto all people." God in Christ is not an angry being, but love in its essence; the loving-kindness of the Father of each, because the Father of all. Hence,

Digitized by Google

earth is a home as well as a school, and in both, the discipline is quickening, unfolding, strengthening, fostering, and that even to the worst. Indeed, in order that no one, how debased so ever, should be shut out from the divine nursery, God has taken his steps on the supposition that man, as man, is a feeble, sinful, and needy creature, for, says the Apostle, "he hath concluded all under sin that he might have mercy upon all." (Gal. iii. 22; Rom. xi. 32.) In this most considerate and compassionate view, the earth is an hospital as well as a nursery, and the only terms of admission are a desire to be healed, and made strong and vigorous. That desire is, with Jesus and Paul, "saving faith." "Wilt thou be made whole," asked Jesus, of "the impotent man." (John v. 6.) "Yes," was the reply, and the "Yes" brought from the Saviour's lips the loving words, "Take up thy bed and walk." (8th verse.)

And thus we are brought to the sheet-anchor of orthodoxy by blood. It is found in Romans ch. 15-17—"The righteouness of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written the just by faith shall live." (Comp. Heb. ii. 4.) What is here termed "the righteousness of God" should be rendered "God's justification"—that is, God's method of making men just. That method, as understood by Paul, has already been described. It is the method of pitying mercy and gentle treatment. In a word, it is loving-kindness—loving-kindness so wise, so patient, so efficacious as to heal, restore, and perfect. This is God's method of dealing with sinners—that is, men in general, and the wicked in particular. And upon the exercise of that method on his side, and your being a patient under the Great Physician on the other, there is one condition, solely one,—You must yearn after health, strength, vigour—in other words, your faith must open the doors of the hospital first, and then of the nursery, and then of the parlour, so that, proceeding from faith to faith, you proceed, under that quickening, and restorative radiance, "from strength to strength," until you stand in the reception chamber of the head of the family "in Zion." (Ps. lxxxiv. 7.) Thus, you see that the veritable saving faith is a yearning after God and goodness; a child-like and loving trust in your Heavenly Father, as manifested and seen in Christ. Hence, faith is a moral quality and a moral power. It is, indeed, a union of hope, love, and trust, operating under a sense as of demerit so of want. Such a faith set the prodigal's feet on his way back to his ancestral home, while the welcome which he met with from his father, who went out to meet him, and meeting him fell on his neck and kissed him, and taking him home made much of him in the midst of family rejoicings;—that welcome how acceptable, how cheering, how salutary. It not only said to him, "Sin no more, never again leave so kind a father; never again abandon so good a home;" but it gave him ever-increasing power to persevere in his wise and righteous determinations.

Such is God's method of salvation. Into what depth of shade does it cast the methods of the Schools!

JOHN R. BEARD.

AN ADDRESS TO BABOO KESHUB CHUNDER SEN.

Oh, Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen,
Ye are the wale o' honest men;
I'll back ye, sir, 'gain ony ten
In London city.

Ye speak yer mind out like a man,
An' daur them to refute wha can;
Some say yer system winna stan'—
The mair's the pity.

I'm maybe wrang, but faith I think
Frae Truth's ain fount ye've taen a drink,
Yer words sae weel wi' nature clink,—
O, man, they're gran'!

To a' men God is gude and kin'—
That's yer belief, and faith it's mine—
His love for us he ne'er shall tine,
He's no' like man.

There's naething in a man's complexion
That doesna fa' to his selection;
Such things are under God's direction,
No' man's ava.

Folk o' a' colours, an' a' creeds
Are blest by God beyond their deeds;
It's kindness that the warl needs
To learn 'boon a'.

Fear God, an' love yer neebors a',
Is plainly taught in Heaven's law.—
There's no' a word 'bout creeds ava,
As far's I ken.

Oh! were this truth but understood,
Man would become one brotherhood,
Each strivin' for the common good
Of a' on earth.

I'm glad that hatefu' thing ca'd *caste*,
Is likely, sir, to fa' at last,
Such foibles men maun yet get past,
Like Chunder Sen.

Then, Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen,
Fecht for the Truth by word and pen,
An' heaven its gracious aid will len',
To speed it forth.—R. S. B.

Digitized by Google

THE DISSENTERS' OBJECTIONS TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND'S DOCTRINES.

IN 1661, at the beginning of Charles II.'s reign, a conference was called by Royal Order, between twelve Prelates and twelve Puritans, for deliberating on alterations in the Liturgy; but four months passed, we are told, without any approach to agreement, as the Bishops would not concede the slightest change to meet the wishes of the Puritans. It is interesting, amidst the present controversies on the Doctrines of the Church, to look back two hundred years and see what were the reasons which in those days prevented men from conforming to the Prayer-book.

The following is a list of eight principal objections submitted by the Puritans at the Conference of 1661:—"1. That no minister is admitted to baptise without using the sign of the cross. 2. That no minister is admitted to officiate without wearing a surplice. 3. That none are admitted to the Lord's Supper without receiving it kneeling. 4. That ministers are obliged to pronounce all baptised persons regenerated by the Holy Ghost. 5. That ministers are obliged to deliver the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ to the unfit. 6. That ministers are obliged to absolve people of their sins, and that in absolute terms. 7. That ministers are forced to give thanks for all whom they bury, as persons whom God has taken to himself. 8. That none may preach who do not subscribe that there is nothing in the Common Prayer-Book, Ordination Service, and the Thirty-nine Articles, contrary to the Word of God."

In addition to sending in this list of objections to the Bishops assembled in Conference, they also presented a paper advocating the omission of repetitions in the Service of Public Worship; that the Litany should be made into one prayer; that free prayer should be allowed instead of only forms; that the Communion Service should be read only when the Lord's Supper is to be administered; that parents should be mentioned as well as sponsors in the Service of Baptism; that the lessons should be taken from the Old and New Testament alone, not from the Apochrypha; that the word *minister* should be used for priest, and *Lord's Day* for Sunday, while All Saints' days should be omitted.

If this is not exactly the list of points that would most obviously form a stumbling-block to us in the Book of Common Prayer, we see in it the firm conscientious spirit of religious independence that ennobled our Puritan forefathers.

ANSWERS TO OUR QUESTIONS ON THE BIBLE.

1. Lament. iv. 20: The breath of our nostrils, the anointed of Jehovah, who was taken in the enemy's pit-falls, is king Jehoiachin, who was conquered by Nebuchadnezzar, and carried into captivity in Babylon.

2. Joel ii. 14: The person who is to turn back, and leave behind him a meal-offering and a drink-offering to Jehovah, is Tiglath-pilezer, king of Assyria, who invaded Judea in the reign of Ahaz. And this sentence is quite enough to prove that the invading army, spoken of by the prophets as locusts, were not the well-known destructive insects, but the Assyrians, whom he describes under that name.

3. Jeremiah xxii. 10: Jehoiakim is the dead king who is not to be wept for; and Jehoahaz, or Shallum, is the one to be wept for, who has been carried prisoner into Egypt.

4. Isaiah xlvi. 11: The ravenous bird called from the east to execute Jehovah's purpose, is Cyrus, king of Persia, who captured Babylon, and sent home the captive Jews.

5. Jeremiah l. 44: The conqueror here meant is the same king Cyrus; but the writer who added this chapter to the Book of Jeremiah, and made use of these words, which Jeremiah had before applied to Nebuchadnezzar, forgot that they were unsuitable to Cyrus, who, when he marched against Babylon, did not come up from the pride or headsprings of the Jordan.

6. Zechariah xi. 8: The three shepherds cut off in one month are Jeroboam II., Zachariah, and Shallum, kings of Israel.

Digitized by Google

THE DOCTRINES OF ORIGINAL SIN.

By Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Author of "Holy Living and Dying," &c., &c.

THE usual doctrines of Original Sin are made the great foundation of the horrible proposition concerning absolute reprobation; the consequences of it reproach God with injustice, they charge God foolishly, and deny his goodness and his wisdom in many instances: and whatsoever can, upon the account of the divine attributes, be objected against the fierce way of absolute decrees; all *that* can be brought for the reproof of their usual propositions concerning *original sin.* For the *consequences* are plain; and by them the necessity of my doctrine, and its usefulness, may be understood.

For, 1. If God decrees us to be *born sinners:* then he makes us be sinners, and then where is his goodness?

2. If God does damn any for that, he damns us *for what we could not help*, and for what *himself did:* and then *where is his justice?*

3. If God sentence us to that damnation, which he cannot in *justice* inflict, *where is his wisdom?*

4. If God, for the sin of Adam, brings upon us a *necessity of sinning;* where is our *liberty?* where is our *nature?* what is become of all laws, and of all virtue and vice? how can men be distinguished from beasts? or the virtuous from the vicious?

5. If, by the fall of Adam, we are so wholly ruined in our faculties that we cannot do any good, but must do evil: how shall any man take care of his ways? or how can it be supposed he should strive against all vice, when he can excuse so much upon his *nature?* or indeed *how shall he strive at all?* For if all *actual* sins are derived from the *original*, and which is *unavoidable*, and yet an *irresistible* cause, then no man can take care to avoid any actual sin, whose cause is natural, and not to be declined. And then *where is his providence and government?*

6. If God does cast infants into hell for the sin of others, and yet did not condemn devils but for their own sin: *where is his love to mankind?*

7. If God chooseth the death of so many millions of persons who are no sinners upon their own stock, and yet swears that he *does not love the death of a sinner*, viz., sinning with his own choice: how can that be credible, he should love to kill innocents, and yet should love to spare the criminal? *Where then is his mercy, and where is his truth?*

8. If God hath given us a nature by derivation, which is wholly *corrupted*, then how can it be, that all which God made, *is good?* For though Adam corrupted himself, yet in propriety of speaking, we did not; but this was the decree of God; and then *where is the excellency of his providence and power, where is the glory of the creation?*

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

The Elder Scholar's Class Book: Second Edition. London, The Sunday School Association, 178 Strand.

We are glad to notice the Second Edition of this very useful work;—not only is it suited for a Sunday school class, but also for the family, and for private reading. Those of our readers who are not familiar with the publications of the Sunday School Association may find in them excellent works for the young. The work under notice was complied by the late Rev. John Robertson of Halstead, a man peculiarly well adapted for encouraging the young to seek after the true wisdom.

ONE RELIGION.

"We are all, I believe, of one religion. I suppose there will come a day in the history of the world when men will be astonished that Catholics, Protestants, and Nonconformists have all had so great animosity and suspicion towards each other. I accept and believe in a very grand passage which I once met with in the writings of the illustrious founder of the state and colony of Pennsylvania. He says, "that humble, meek, merciful, just, pious, and devout souls are everywhere of one religion, and that when death has taken off the mask they will know one another, though the different liveries they wear here make them strangers."—*John Bright.*

Digitized by Google

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

SIXTH LESSON.

To Find Nouns in the Dictionary.

GREEK Nouns are classified by the ending of the Nominative and Genitive cases Singular. And, as the ordinary dictionary cannot give all cases, it gives the Noun spelt with the ending of the Nominative Singular, and to that adds the ending of the Genitive.

Therefore, when we want to find the English of a Noun by means of the dictionary, our first thought must be, "Which case is it in?" And, if not Nominative, of which declension is it? that we may change its final letter to the Nominative-ending, to be able to look it out in the dictionary. And to make this change, use the Table of Noun-endings given in the last lesson.

But now we will try to learn which case the Nouns are in by the sense of the sentence.

1st. To Recognise the Nominative Case.

The chief word in every sentence is, as we know, the Verb. And the Verb usually has some Noun in the Nominative case, or Pronoun (expressed or understood), that governs the Verb, and is called the *Nominative to the Verb;* if we would find which Noun in the sentence it is that governs the Verb, we must put the word *Who*, or *What*, before the Verb, and ask thus, "What is to be hallowed?" (line 2.) The word that answers the question is *Nominative to the Verb:* and hence the answer is, "the *name* is to be hallowed," so ονομα, *name*, is *Nominative*, and will be found in the dictionary, with the Genitive-ending attached thus, ονομα, ατος (to be read ονομα, ονοματος), *a name*, *of a name*, 3d declension, see Table.

Again, on lines 3 and 4, take the Verbs, and ask, "What is to come?" "What is to be done?" Answer, "The *Kingdom* is to come;" "The *Will* is to be done;" then the two Nouns βασιλεια, *kingdom*, and θελημα, *will*, are both *Nominative*, and will be found in the dictionary, βασιλεια, ας (1st declension), θελημα, ατος (3d declension) see Table.

2d. To Recognise the Accusative Case.

Every Active Verb (but not a Neuter or Passive Verb), has some Noun or Pronoun that it governs, and puts into some case, oftenest into the *Accusative*, but sometimes into the Dative, or Genitive case.

In our lesson below, the first three Verbs are, Passive, Neuter, and Passive, and govern no case. But on line 7, δος, *give*, is an Active Verb, and will have some Noun or Pronoun in the sentence that δος will be governing, or putting into, the *Accusative case*. And to find which Noun this is, first find the Nominative by asking, "Who is to give?" answer, "Thou;" and having that, take the Nominative and Verb together to find the *Accusative*, and add the word *What*, and ask thus, "Do thou give what?" and the word that answers the question is the *Accusative after* the Verb. The answer here, of course, is *bread*, so the Noun αρτον *bread*, is the *Accusative case*.

Now, for looking the word out in the dictionary, the Table of Noun-endings shows that ον (the ending of αρτον) is Accusative Singular, 2d declension; and the masculine Article τον, *the*, shows which gender to choose, so by the Table the word to look out in the dictionary will be αρτος, and thus we find it αρτος, ου (Nominative with Genitive ending.)

3d. Dative Case.

Notice that some Verbs govern two cases, as for instance the Greek Verbs *give* and *forgive*, both of them govern Accusative and Dative. See, on lines 7, 8, 9, ἡμιν, *to us*, οφειλεταις, *debtors*, both these words are Dative, made so by the Verb preceeding each.

Digitized by Google

The Lord's Prayer.

Matthew vi. 9-13.

1 Πατερ ἡμων, ὁ εν τοις ουρανοις,
Father of us, the [one] in the Heavens,
2 ἁγιασθητω το ονομα σου·
be hallowed the name of thee;
3 ελθετω ἡ βασιλεια σου·
come the kingdom of thee;
4 γενηθητω το θελημα σου,
be done the will of thee,
5 ὡς εν ουρανῳ, και επι της γης·
as in Heaven, also upon the earth;
6 τον αρτον ἡμων τον επιουσιον
the bread of us, the daily,
7 δος ἡμιν σημερον· και αφες
give to us to-day; and forgive
8 ἡμιν τα οφειλημματα ἡμων, ὡς και
to us the debts of us, as also
9 ἡμεις αφιεμεν τοις οφειλεταις ἡμων·
we forgive to the debtors of us;
10 και μη εισενεγκης ἡμας εις πειρασμον,
And not thou mayest lead us into temptation,
11 αλλα ῥυσαι ἡμας απο του πονηρου.
but deliver us from the evil.

And now we would beg our pupils to repeat the English words of the prayer in the order they stand under the Greek, and forgetting what at first seems awkward, notice the beauty and emphasis of the Greek order of words. Before long we hope they will learn to repeat the Lord's Prayer by heart in Greek, as readily as they do in English.

To the Editor of the Unitarian Missionary.

Sir,—In the "Greek Testament Class," in the *Unitarian Missionary* for this month we are directed to "Notice that ὁ, on line 7, is not the Article, but the Neuter Nominative of the Relative Pronoun ὁς, ἡ, ὁ, *who*, and it is by the context we have to decide which it is." In the Greek Lexicon and Grammar I find it thus, ὅ, distinguished from ὁ; and also in Griesbach's Greek Testament, in the passage quoted, Matt. xii., verse 36, it is the same ὅ.—Yours truly,

G. G. G.

May 6, 1872.

P.S.—Permit me to add that I am much pleased with the *Missionary*, and think it just the kind of Journal now required. And having just turned my attention to the Greek of the New Testament, I find the "Greek Lessons" very useful.

[Our correspondent is quite right. In the First Lesson, the omission of accents generally, is accounted for. In this case an exception might have been made.—Ed.]

MISSIONARY WORK.

COUPAR-ANGUS.

Popular attention here has been drawn to the consideration of the Doctrines of Orthodoxy, chiefly, in the first instance, from the efforts of Mr John Robertson, a remarkably well informed gentleman, who, having come to the knowledge of a better and truer position than that of the Free Church of Scotland, of which he was a member, tried to maintain the right of Free speech and thought for himself and brethren within that church. He, however, was expelled as a heretic. As soon as the excitement had passed over, Mr Williamson, of Dundee, started a course of lectures expository of Unitarian Christianity. This paved the way for lectures from the Rev. R. B. Drummond, of Edinburgh, and the Rev. J. Page Hopps of Glasgow. With the announcement of the lectures of Mr Hopps, the orthodox party aroused themselves, and telegraphed to Dundee for the Rev. John Bowes, who appeared at Mr Hopps' lecture, and was supported by an E. U. Minister and a U. P. Elder. After the chairman, the Rev. John Robertson, had introduced Mr Hopps, this party endeavoured to obstruct the proceedings by importuning the lecturer to promise to debate with them at the close of the lecture. This Mr Hopps refused to do. Since then Mr Bowes has lectured against his own description of Unitarian Christianity; and still later he has attacked what he terms infidelity; and his last address, from the placards announcing it, appeared to have been intended as a personal attack upon Mr John Robertson.

It is worth notice that this champion of Orthodoxy has brought out what he terms a "Translation of the New Testament," in which notes are found explaining the omission in the text of the spurious passages, as for example 1 John v. 7, Mark xvi. 9-20. His ability as a translator may be judged from his changing "swine" into "hogs," "husks" into "pods," and "poor" into "mendicants;" for the word "hate," in Luke xiv. 26, he has substituted "has not less regard for," which is a deception.

Digitized by Google

BLAIRGOWRIE

is a large village of Perthshire, of easy access from Dundee. The Editor of the *Missionary* lately visited it, with the view of inviting the inhabitants to the consideration of the Unitarian form of Christianity. He knew of no one there that would give him a word of welcome. He sent placards announcing the meeting, and at the time appointed there was an audience assembled, who seemed moved with curiosity and interest to listen to a Unitarian lecture. The lecturer gave a plain unvarnished account of the better hope possessed by Unitarians. After he had finished, he invited questions from the audience. The following Monday night he returned. The hall could not contain half the people who sought admission. On the 18th May he secured a larger hall, and had an audience of about 300.

FORFAR.

The Editor of the *Missionary* gave two lectures in this town recently, in the small Reid Hall. He has been to Forfar several times. He had an audience each night of about 100.

COLYTON.

The Rev. R. E. Dunne is now delivering a course of thirteen "Sunday afternoon Lectures" in the Unitarian Chapel at Colyton. Any of our friends who purpose visiting the beautiful scenery of Devonshire, will do well to encourage the struggling congregation in that town by their presence on Sundays. An attractive syllabus of these lectures has been circulated, "affectionately" inviting all Truth seekers, and all who attend no place of worship, to come and hear them.

NOTES OF PROGRESS.

ENGLAND.

The Unitarian congregation at Sale, near Manchester, (Rev. Dr. Beard's), at a recent meeting, it was recommended to build a new Sunday School-room. At Monton, also, near Manchester, a larger chapel is required, and at a private and preliminary meeting we understand £700 were subscribed.

A highly respectable clergyman of Congleton, Cheshire, who built himself a church, lately changed his religious opinions, resigned his living, and gave up the building. He now evinces a lively interest in the Unitarian congregation in that town.

DUNDEE.

The Rev. David Cooke, for twenty-five years minister of a Congregational Church in Dundee, has resigned his pulpit. He stated, in his farewell sermon, that he had outgrown the creed with which he began his ministry, and that no minister in the town had possessed a greater amount of freedom from dogmatic restrains of late than himself. In an address presented to him at the farewell meeting, the following remarkable passage occurs:—"You have led us to prize more the spirit which giveth life than the letter which killeth—to recur always to an older writing than that in any parchment, however venerable—to the fleshly tables of the heart as often as to the tables of stone." Reduced to plain language, this, we suppose, means, that the Bible is not what Orthodox Christians assert it is. We think there is a strong expression in favour of Universalism in—"We have been brought to rest in the belief that good shall ultimately absorb and vanquish evil, so that when the pile is complete, "God shall be all in all in the Universe." In a quiet way it has been rumoured that this church was not quite like other Independent Churches in the town. But it was not until the minister was closing his relation with the congregation that the above statements were made public.

The Rev. George Gilfillan, at a Soiree connected with the ordination of an E. U. minister, is reported to have spoken somewhat strongly against a lecture of Dr. Cairns:—

"Dr Cairns expressed his horror that a minister of the Established Church should have lately received into his pulpit and fraternised with such divine men as Jowett and Dean Stanley. Dr Cairns was exceedingly angry at this, and the more so because Jowett, in one of his sermons delivered to the Established Church in Edinburgh, passed a rich panegyric upon that great man Benedict Spinoza; and therefore Dr Cairns was exceedingly horrified, and utters an awful anathema both against the minister who admitted Jowett and upon Jowett himself. Were there no United Presbyterian ministers who, in similar circumstances, would have acted exactly as Dr Wallace did? He thought there were some on the platform, he was certain there was one. (Applause.) Were there no Free Church ministers who, if they had not been greatly belied, were standing upon the very same platform of theological thought as Jowett? He was much mistaken if there was not one there that night. (Applause.) If these were the sentiments of the men who were trying to form great united religious bodies, that none of our great philosophical lights or theological thinkers should be allowed to speak unless they had first signed the Westminster Confession of Faith, unless they had first proved that they were thoroughly orthodox, to the last "it" and "and" that Dr Cairns might search out, then it was high time the liberal thinkers in our land, with whatever religious body connected, and however different in shades of opinion, should form a great union, but a union more of spirit than of form, and like the ancient Highlanders stand 'shouther to shouther.'"

We are not sure that Mr Gilfillan is a representative man in the United Presbyterian Church; but there can be no doubt but that there are a great many people who like to hear him utter sentiments like the above. Unfortunately, when Mr Gilfillan had an opportunity of doing something, he failed to meet the expectations of many, even members, of his own congregation. But, aside from this, it must be admitted that Mr Gilfillan has done a very great deal to enlighten the public mind in Dundee by his lectures and his contributions to the local press.

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

No. 7. JULY 1872. PRICE 1D.

THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By the Rev. EPHRAIM TURLAND, Ainsworth.

THIS is a subject respecting which great obscurity exists in men's minds. Many speak of the New Testament as the "Word of God" in such a way as to show that they are quite strangers to this question of the canon. Many others speak with apparent hypocrisy: for they falsify the facts, and persuade the people that there is no question of the canon open to debate. Note what the 6th Article of the English Church says upon the point: " . . . those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, *of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church* . . . all the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them canonical." The affirmation here is, that all the books in our present English New Testament are canonical, there having never been any doubt in the Church respecting their authority. This is utterly false and misleading. It is a pity that ordinary people, who have little time to study these questions for themselves, should so long have been at the mercy of such unfounded assertions as these. The fact is, there has been doubt in the Church respecting the following books of our present New Testament:—The Epistle to the Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Revelation. One may say with general truth that all the prominent theologians in the Church of the first three centuries and a half, excepting Athanasius, doubted or rejected one, or more, or all of the above-named seven books. The reader is asked to see this with his own eyes by studying the question for himself as far as he has opportunity. Still, a few brief considerations, added here, may be useful to some.

Jesus wrote nothing: his instruction was oral. People heard him, and remembered some things that he said. Some wrote down certain things referring to his words or his life, others made note of still other utterances. Thus, different collections were formed of the life and words of Jesus, varying from one another, and being gradually used to supplement one another. There were *many* of these collections, not simply *four*. There were eventually only four acknowledged from various fantastic reasons, such as—The Church represents the world; and, as there are four cardinal points, so the Gospel must be a four-fold column to support the Church; or, the Gospels are four, in order to represent the four cherubims. Many of those *other* Gospels enjoyed great popularity; but, belonging to parties in the Church who did not ultimately *gain sway*, they were finally disallowed.—There are, in the writings of the Apostolical Fathers, many quotations of the words of Jesus. These are of uncertain form. In some cases they agree, in words or in thought, with our present Gospels; in other cases they disagree;—some quotations may have

Digitized by Google

been taken from our present Gospels, others are carelessly given from memory, and others were certainly taken from some of the *other* Gospels, for there is nothing like them in our New Testament. Clement of Rome, Barnabas, and Ignatius quote, as Scripture, words which could not have been taken from what have been called canonical sources.—The Apostolic letters were sent round from church to church, and thus, collections of them were gradually formed; but these perpetually varied in the number and authorship of their contents. They were read for religious edification, not as infallible authorities. In the early age *tradition* was greatly preferred to Scripture; when the orthodox afterwards had to engage in controversy, they decided by tradition as to the authority of Scriptures; the mere question of the canon (or collection) of these writings was a minor one; what one should hold to was the custom of the most important churches, especially such as were founded by Apostles. These things are best seen in the writings of Tertullian, particularly in his little book, entitled "Prescriptions against Heretics."

It has been said that seven books in our present New Testament have been doubted or rejected in the Church; remember, then, further, that certain other books, now called Apocryphal, were received in the early church, were quoted as holy scripture by prominent Fathers, and were included in some ancient versions. The epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, and Hermas or the Shepherd, enjoyed great reputation. Many received, also, and quoted with great respect, the "Apocalypse" and the "Preaching" of Peter, as also epistles such as that of Barnabas, and Gospels innumerable. *The Canon was not fixed*, in fact; men quoted for edification; and only *gradually* and *unofficially* were some books preferred to others. The various canons or catalogues found in ancient writers vary, and prove the same thing. Marcion's Collection did not include all our present New Testament; but it comprised the Epistle to the Laodiceans, which we have not. The Canon of Muratori knows nothing of the Epistles of James and Peter, or that to the Hebrews, while it includes, on the other hand, letters to the Laodiceans and Alexandrians, and the Apocalypse of Peter. Athanasius, as has been said, has, in his canon of the first degree, the books which we have in our existing New Testament, no more, no less; but he acknowledges that other books were habitually made use of in religious education, distinguished from these solely in degree: amongst these other books he mentions Hermas and the Apostolical Constitutions. His contemporary, Gregory of Nazianzen, in a canon or catalogue which he gives, omits the Apocalypse. Amphilochius of Iconium shows the doubt that existed in his time (c. 380) as to 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and the Apocalypse. The canon of the Council of Laodicea omits the Apocalypse. The "Apostolical Canons" include two Epistles of Clement and the "Constitutions." The pretended decree of Pope Gelasius is, in some copies, identical with our present collection, but, in others, it omits the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. Numberless other instances might be given; but let these suffice to prove that the collections continually varied,—*that there was no fixed canon.* The Council of Trent decided that the so-called Apocryphal books are on a level with the others, and altogether form the canon of the Scriptures; Luther, Calvin, &c., rejected certain books on theological grounds —Luther especially accepting only those which were in agreement with his theology, and treating with small courtesy the Epistles of James, Jude, and Hebrews, and the Apocalypse; and modern Biblical criticism, taking a calm unprejudiced view of the whole subject of the history of the canon of the New Testament, shows that it perpetually varied,—that it was not officially and authoritatively formed—that it left out or took in books according to the locality and the preferences of the copyist or particular church—that, in short, the question was minor, and was determined gradually by the needs of religious edification, and the tradition of the principal communities.—These remarks are intended to excite curiosity, and to induce the reader to study the subject personally;—and, therefore, I have given no dates, and have left unnoticed a crowd of important facts. In presence of the ignorant Bible-worshipping spirit which yet prevails, I fear not to say that this is an exceedingly important subject for us all. *There is no Bible*, in the ordinary sense of that term; but there is *a Christian literature*, more varied than many

Digitized by Google

conceive. The general conclusion to which a study of this matter leads me is, that the Christian instinct has done wisely, in the main, in gradually accepting some books and rejecting others; but that, in particular cases, such as that of the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, it has done unwisely, and thereby deprived the mass of Christians of religious edification which might otherwise have been theirs.

OPINIONS ON THE NATURE OF CHRIST.

THE three opinions about the nature of Christ, which are held by our various sects, arise from the different education of the persons holding them. First, we have the Churchman, whether Romanist or Anglican. His opinion is based upon his fundamental dogma—that "The Church has authority in matters of faith." Hence, as the Church of the ignorant Middle Ages has settled that Jesus was Almighty God, the Churchman accepts that opinion. He may himself be an educated scholar, quite able to judge for himself, if he wished. But he does not wish. He wishes to be guided by the Church. It is useless to quote the Bible to him, or to appeal to his own good sense. He may be a thinker, but he means to profess as the Church orders him. Then, as the ecclesiastical revennes, building, and titles are all on his side, the crowd, who are governed by fashion, hold, or profess to hold, the same opinion.

Secondly, we have the uneducated, or at least uncritical, Protestant, who would take his opinions for himself out of the Bible. To such a man Jesus is a superhuman being, to be worshiped accordingly. This opinion is of course held by a large party, the earnest and uneducated, who are beyond the reach of fashion's attractions.

Thirdly, we have the educated or critical Protestant, who has studied the language of the Bible, and who is able to weigh the contradictory statements, and to make allowance for the eastern expressions. To him Jesus is a simple human being, a teacher whose admiring disciples have spoken of him in terms higher than what our more exact habits allow us to apply to any man. This opinion is professed by few; because it requires not only intelligence to form it, but courage to own it when formed. This is the strictly Unitarian opinion.

THE ATONEMENT DOCTRINE IN SEVERAL FORMS.

SEVERAL different theories have been invented to explain the way in which the death of Christ procures our forgiveness. The Greek and Latin Christian writers, during some centuries, taught that the death of Christ was a *ransom paid to the Devil* to redeem from his power the souls which had legally fallen into his hands and become his property in consequence of their sins. The apostle Paul expresses a thought older than Christianity and borrows a figure from paganism when he says, that "to whom ye yield yourselves slaves to obey, his slaves are ye to whom ye obey." By and by when Christians had taken the Devil bodily into their theology and given him a very important share in the management of the world, we find their writers discussing this notion of the blood of Christ being the price of our redemption paid to the Devil. Origen in the third century, and Augustine in the fourth century, write on this subject. But the doctrine was not universally taken up. We find one writer arguing that it would be a shameful thing indeed if such a price was paid to the Wicked One, while another is of opinion that although so paid, it was more than he was fairly entitled to. Some even say that our redemption might have been effected by Christ in some other way than by his death.

The second theory was that which arose in the middle ages, and is known in these days as the scheme of "Satisfaction." Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, who died in 1109, was one of the first to teach that the death of Christ was an equivalent for the *debt due to God* on account of human transgression, and that, the debt being paid, the debtors might be forgiven. This

Digitized by Google

view prevailed for many hundred years, but not altogether to the exclusion of the first. Some writers show a mixed doctrine. Thus Thomas Aquinas, who died in 1274, says, that "in consequence of sin man was a debtor to God as a judge, and to the devil as a tormentor, and with respect to God, justice required that man should be redeemed, but not with respect to the devil, so that Christ paid his blood to God and not to the devil." This doctrine of "Satisfaction," or atonement made to God by the death of Christ, was taken up by the Reformers in the 16th century, and was reduced by them to a regular system, with the added notions of transferred guilt and imputed righteousness. The original idea that sin lays us under a debt to God is a figure of speech used by Jesus, who bids us pray to our Father in heaven to forgive us our debts; and his parable of the servant who owed ten thousand talents and was not able to pay is a true representation of some of the strongest feelings of conscience; but against the inconsistency and absurdity of building this unreal structure upon it, we may quote the words of Faustus Socinus, the Italian Unitarian, who took refuge in Transylvania at the time of the Reformation, and who endeavoured to explain after his fashion the true way in which Christianity obtains for us the forgiveness of God. "This method of rescuing us from the punishment of our sins," he says, "is very different from that which implies a satisfaction for them. Nothing can be more repugnant to each other than a free pardon and satisfaction."

The third theory of redemption was that of Grotius, who taught that the death of Christ was a manifestation of God's displeasure against sin, and was necessary to enable God, as a moral governor, to forgive the sinner without impairing the respect due to the moral law. This has been called the theory of "public justice" and some of the orthodox writers have illustrated it by the story of the King of the Locrians. It was a law among this people, we are told, that in cases of grave crime the criminal was to lose both his eyes. But when the King's own son was found to be guilty, and was brought before his father to be judged, the King broke his own law by saving one of his son's eyes and plucking out one of his own eyes instead. The claims of justice were hereby supposed to be met. But the story to the minds of Unitarians is simply an example of the ignorance of a barbarous age, which it is absurd and misleading to bring forward to-day as a serious argument.

These two forms of the Atonement doctrine are still to be met with. The older and sterner Calvinists of last century held the scheme of *satisfaction*, the modern orthodox more commonly incline to the theory of *public justice*. The three forms are very clearly and neatly put side by side by Dr Freeman Clarke in his little volume on the Christian Doctrine of Forgiveness of Sin. The history of the two earlier, namely, Christ's death a price paid to the Devil, and that other which it gradually grew into, the payment of this price to God, is carefully traced by Dr Priestley in his History of the Corruptions of Christianity, part 2, secs. 5-7.

EVIL NECESSARY.

To the Editor of the Unitarian Missionary.

Whatever men may choose to say or think, it is certain that, in the maintaining of sensible existence and conscious apprehension, there is as much necessity for me to experience bad positions as there is to experience good: without the two, stimulatic irritability could not take place, and life, whether present or future, can only be made manifest by contrary properties. The annihilation of evil would be the sleep of good; because good can only be lucent in its operative intentions on the supposition or ground of evil. True, one may exist without the other, but not manifested without the other. There is a concatenation of operations absolutely necessary to illustrate the existence of both, without which, there could be no irritability, no stimulation—the absence of which would be quiescence and immobility of being. Destroy the idea of existing evil, and good must necessarily be shrouded—there could be nothing to encounter—nothing to rectify—nothing to arrange and neutralize; and, as a matter of course, nothing by which to exercise its merciful disposition—nothing by which its component attributes might be made lucent to itself. Good can no more show itself to itself, than the seen can reflect its own emanative rays without the aid of a reflector. The manifestation of all derivative existence depends, either upon an ideal, or real existence of evil; without which, all attributive entities would necessarily remain neutral—that is, neither good nor bad; and then, an immobility of state, for the want of contrarities, would be the inevitable result. What is justice without criminality? what are its discernments without opposites? what is mercy without offence? Can it shine? what is to reflect it? Could good operate to restrain evil, if evil did not exist? Evil, therefore, may be said to be the absence of good, or good not reflected, for the want of evil as the reflector. The opacity of evil is necessary to reflect the rays of good.

Broughty Ferry. Wm. Robertson.

[We wish to impress upon our correspondents the importance of expressing themselves in the plainest words, so that all may understand. We fear the above will not be quite intelligible to some.—Ed.]

Digitized by Google

"BEWARE OF THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES."

WHEN the translator has done his work, and rendered into plain English the original Greek of the New Testament, there yet remains much work for the commentator before the religious wisdom which it contains can be made wholly useful to correct the faults of our generation. Many readers are probably little aware how applicable the text quoted above is to themselves. They fancy that the Pharisees were guilty of some fault peculiar to their own day and their own circumstances; but many among ourselves, and Unitarians in particular, would do well to study the force of the above words. The Pharisees were a highly creditable body of people, learned, and in every way respectable; and it was that very respectability, or rather the self-sufficiency arising from it, that Jesus meant to blame under the name of their leaven. Those who wish to make the Unitarians a respectable body, rather than a useful body; those who would sacrifice, in our ministers, missionary zeal in favour of learning; those who would wish our religious services to be copied from the Established Church, rather than from the humbler Wesleyans, are all falling into the fault described as the leaven of the Pharisees. Those who wish to gain converts from among the rich who attend the parish church, rather than from among the poor who go to no place of worship, all fall into the same fault. They value respectability above usefulness; they dislike zeal for their opinions; they dislike lay-preaching; they would rather have no Unitarian place of worship at all in their town than a humble one; they wish the small congregations throughout the country closed because they do us, as they think, no credit; that is to say, they lessen the appearance of our worldly prosperity. To all such persons we would say "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees."

BALAAM AND THE ASS.

IN the 22d chapter of the Book of Numbers, we are told how Balak, the King of Moab, fearfully alarmed at finding the victorious army of Israel encamped against him, despatched messengers to Balaam, entreating he would come quickly, and curse the invaders. Balaam, having had an interview with the envoys, consulted Jehovah as to the course he should pursue, and received the definite and peremptory answer (v. 12), "Thou shalt *not* go with them; thou shalt *not* curse the people; for they are blessed." Being thus disappointed in his first attempt, the Moabitish King sent a second set of messengers, higher in rank, and bearing more costly gifts, to urge his request with still greater earnestness. The Prophet, not satisfied with the answer he had already received, again consulted Jehovah; and was this time accorded the permission he so eagerly coveted. He therefore commences his long journey from the banks of the Euphrates; and during that journey is said to have occurred one of those incidents, of which there are a few others in the Old Testament, which excite the mockery of the sceptic, and occasion distress to the humble believer;—I allude, of course, to the story of Balaam's *Ass* having thrice seen the angel of Jehovah in the way with a naked sword in his hand to oppose their advance; of the poor beast's having each time started aside from the apparition, and nearly thrown his rider; of that rider's having beaten him savagely for his contumacy; and then of the naturally dumb and naturally unreasoning animal absolutely *speaking* to his master, remonstrating with him, arguing with him, rebuking him, enlightening him! Now, I have no objection to *miracle* in the abstract; but it must be miracle performed for a worthy purpose, and especially for a purpose promotive of the moral and spiritual interests of humanity. Such appear to me to be nearly all the miracles recorded in the New Testament, especially the wonders of pity and mercy

Digitized by Google

wrought by Christ on the poor and afflicted, and emphatically his own re-awakening from the tomb. At the same time, both my intellect and my feelings of reverence towards GOD compel me to reject the gross fable of Balaam and the Ass. We must prostrate our understandings altogether before we could accept it; and God cannot require us thus to divest ourselves of any portion of the image of Himself in which He originally fashioned us.

Besides its inherent improbability, this alleged transaction is surrounded by a number of minor improbabilities, and even of palpable contradictions. The Prophet expresses not the slightest *astonishment* at the quadruped addressing him in human speech; but takes the matter as composedly, and carries on his own part of the discussion as calmly as if the whole were but an ordinary occurrence! Now, supposing the Ass to have actually spoken, could Balaam have been thus self-possessed? Would he not, on the contrary, have sprung from its back in terror, and either fled into the wilderness, or cast himself before Jehovah in an agony of alarm at such a portent? This absence of the slightest feeling of dread, or even of surprise, on the part of Balaam, goes far of itself to discredit the story.

Moreover, this narrative charges God, by implication, with weakness and changeableness of purpose, with infirmity of disposition, and with unfairness of conduct towards Balaam; and this, or a third of this, is enough to confound it utterly. Do we not read, at v. 20, "And God came unto Balaam at night, and said unto him, If the men come to call thee, rise up, and *go with them*"? And do we not read, at v. 22, "And God's anger was kindled, *because he went*"? Is this a Being with whom is "neither variableness nor shadow of turning;"—first, to give Balaam permission to go; then, to be angry with him for going; next, to send his angel to prevent his going; lastly, to order that angel to kill him if he persists in going? At all hazards, in forming our religious opinions, we must keep the perfections of the Supreme unassailable and unimpeachable; and any thing which assails or impeaches them, whether out of the Bible or in the Bible, must be instantaneously repudiated both by our understandings and our consciences. We Unitarians (thanks be to heaven for that great privilege!) are not slaves of the "letter," but willing servants of the "Spirit;" we do not hold that every chapter and verse in the Scriptures was dictated by the Creator himself; we feel ourselves, therefore, perfectly at liberty, while receiving with joy unspeakable every thing in their venerated pages that can minister to our holiness, our benevolence, our devotion, our loyalty to every name and aspect of duty, to *withhold our assent* from aught we therein discover which is irreconcileable with our worthiest and loftiest, and thence with our truest, conceptions of the Most High.

R. E. B. MACLELLAN.

WHO PAID FOR THE LONDON MANSION-HOUSE?

THERE is an Act of Parliament, and a very proper one, which requires every man who is selected to the office of Sheriff in the City of London to serve, or to pay a fine to the Corporation of £400. It is a fine not often levied, because there are usually many citizens desirous of the honour. There was also lately an Act of Parliament, and a very unjust one, meant to exclude Dissenters from all such offices; and by this a fine of £500 was to be paid by every man who accepted any office in a Corporation without taking the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper from a clergyman of the Church of England, and according to the rites of that Church. This unjust Act, which was passed in Charles II.'s time, has in our time been repealed. But while it was in force, about a hundred years ago, some clever lawyer saw that by means of it, and the earlier Act mentioned above, he could get the Dissenters into a corner, and make a little money for the Corporation out of their conscientious scruples. Accordingly, he got a Dissenter elected to the office of Sheriff—a thing that had not happened for a hundred years. The gentleman elected was a rich man, and he paid the fine of £400 to escape serving, and having either to take the Church Sacrament, or to pay the heavier

Digitized by Google

fine of £500 for not taking it. As soon as his fine was paid, a second wealthy Dissenter was elected, and he also paid his fine; and so on to the number of forty-five. By this time the Dissenters were roused to resist; and the forty-sixth man refused to pay the fine, and the City brought an action against him in the Court of King's Bench. There it was decided in his favour; the Judge explaining the law—namely, that the Act which disqualified a Dissenter must be held to relieve him of the duty. But the City was not satisfied with this decision, which deprived them of what promised to be a source of great wealth. So they appealed to the House of Lords. There, however, justice again prevailed, and the City was again beaten.

The Corporation was at that time building a new Mansion House as a residence for the Lord-Mayor—that which may now be seen in the City; and by a vote of the Corporation these fines which had been so wickedly levied on the Dissenters, instead of being honestly returned to them, were applied to pay for the new mansion. The amount was £18,000, or forty-five times £400. The Mansion House remains as a monument of the unjust manner in which Dissenters were treated in the last century.

RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES BELIEVED BY UNITARIANS.

By the Rev. John Wright, B.A., Bury.

No. 3.—THE IMMORTALITY OF MAN.

EACH human being feels that throughout the whole of his life on earth he is one and the same individual, that his personal identity remains unchanged. In many respects the youth differs from the infant, the mature man from the youth, the old man from all the other periods of life; nevertheless each one is fully assured that through all these changes he continues the same person. The belief in "the immortality of man" means the belief that after death this same separate personal existence is prolonged, and that it goes on for ever. Into the consideration of this subject there need not enter any questions as to whether in the future life there will be anything corresponding to the bodily organisation we now possess, as to the mode or conditions of the existence beyond the grave, or as to the states and employments of those who are no longer on earth. If we believe that every human being, as a separate personal existence, not only lives in this world, but also *will live* for ever, whatever else we believe or deny, we acknowledge the Immortality of Man.

It is natural to man to hold this faith. This is proved by the prevalence of the belief in successive ages, in separate countries, under every different form of civilisation, and in every varying religion. The pictures drawn of that future state, and the grounds on which the belief has been founded, have been changing and diversified, but the conviction of its reality has remained the same. When one who has long lived with us, who has been active in doing us good, with whose being our own being has been closely intertwined, is taken from us, we feel a difficulty in believing that his life is over, we are unable to conceive that the existence which has been so valuable to many loving hearts is for ever closed, and the natural instinct of man prompts him to speak of such a one as departed rather than annihilated. It is true that there have been found men to doubt and deny immortality. But what kind of men? Not the savage, not the untaught, not those dependent on the promptings of natural feeling, but the argumentative and philosophical who have trusted the logical intellect rather than the instinctive feeling. Hence we may conclude that it is natural to us all to believe in our immortality, and that we may trust in and yield to this general natural tendency, unless there are intellectual difficulties sufficiently powerful to compel us to reject it, unless the reason obliges us to deny it. We must consider therefore these intellectual difficulties and see if they are insurmountable.

Digitized by Google

1. Persons often say—"We have no instance in our own experience of the existence of a sentient being without bodily organisation, and we are therefore justified in concluding that when the bodily organisation perishes, the being at the same time ceases." The answer is, that to measure all future possibilities by present experience is unwarrantable presumption; even if we do not know in this world of existence apart from a body, this does not prove that there cannot be such existence. But every believer in God thinks of Him as existing without material organisation, and if so, why should a spiritual being be thought impossible for his children? Besides, we do not, in believing in human immortality, necessarily suppose that it will be immaterial; God can provide for us a new body if He thinks fit to do so. Man while on earth changes his body. The old man has not one single material particle of his body the same which he had in youth, yet he is the same individual. The difficulty is met therefore by showing—1. that it is presumptuous to measure possibilities by our own limited experience; 2. that even depending on this experience, believers in God can recognise spiritual existence; 3. that the doctrine of human immortality does not necessarily involve life without organisation.

II. It may be pointed out that the mental powers are frequently affected by bodily disease, that as the body decays in old age all the other powers grow weak with it, and hence it may be concluded that when the body dies, the soul dies also. But there are many exceptions to this statement, many instances in which, with an infirm and suffering body, the mind is clear, the thoughts are vivid, the heart is loving, many instances in which, to extreme old age, the spirit continues to manifest undiminished power. These show that the decay of the body is not necessarily accompanied by mental and spiritual decay. That the two so often seem to go together may arise from the fact, that when the body grows weak the spirit has no longer the power to *manifest* itself by bodily activity as it once did; but this does not prove that the spirit is itself about to cease to be.

III. Great stress is laid by those who doubt about a future life on their not knowing any instance in which one has come back from the grave to tell them that he still lives. But it should be remembered how many millions of human beings believe that there have been such communications in some form or other. We may not have ourselves experienced them, we may believe that many of the accounts of them are tinged with vulgar superstition, but we are not justified in denouncing such occurrences as impossible, or in refusing credit for earnest sincerity to those who say they have had this experience. But even if the grave is an "undiscovered country from whose bourn no traveller returns," if no voice from its deep silence can ever reach our ears to assure us there is an existence beyond it, this merely proves that communication between the dead and the living is not permitted, it does not prove that the dead are annihilated.

Turning from the consideration of difficulties, let us now ask, Does the reason give any indications in confirmation of the instinctive belief in Immortality?

I. The human will is self-active, and determines by its volitions the course of individual conduct; it orginates movement. This power is so near akin to the creative power of God himself, that it leads us to expect that it also shares in his eternal existence. If the will needs no outward impulse but moves of and by itself, it will never stop its movements unless a violent end is put to its being, that is, unless God changes the whole order of his providence. Each separate human will is an emanation from the Divine will, and in giving us individual personality He at the same time gives us individual immortality.

II. Believing in God, we also believe that He has made nothing in vain, that He has not created any order of beings to be all destroyed before any of them gains its full growth. Look at man; see him standing strong in his integrity against tempting bribes and threatening dangers; see him by the power of intellect gathering in stores of knowledge and wisdom; remember what an unmeasured capacity for learning, what an unbounded strength of will, what an unceasing tenderness of love there is within him;—and then say, can all this be given only to commence its growth and never to gain its full ripe completeness? Who feels that his life, however long, enables him to learn all there is to be learnt? Who doubts, when death draws near, that he is capable of further growth? Who has not love in his heart that can last beyond the time of earthly existence? Our various cap-

Digitized by Google

acities only dawn, as it were, in this world; are they never to have the opportunity to brighten to the perfect day? The greatest philosopher, at the end of a laborious life, says that with all his discoveries he has only been picking up pebbles on the shores of the infinite ocean of truth; is his mind never to have the opportunity of growing to its full stature? Two loving hearts, closely united by affection, enjoy a year or two of wedded happiness, and then death takes one away; was that flower of love caused by a good God to open so sweetly only that it might be so soon eternally blighted? There is in the heroism of moral greatness a nobility which stirs the admiring reverence of all beholders; does not such moral power, braver than pain, mightier than monarch's sceptre, stronger than death, argue for itself an eternity of being? The capability of intellectual and moral progress in man is unlimited. Surely this indicates for him, in the purposes of God, an eternity of being.

I have now attemped to show that the instinctive belief in immortality, which is natural to man, is not disproved by the intellectual difficulties which may rise against it; and that it is confirmed by the facts, that the will being self-active has in itself the seeds of eternal being, that the intellect and moral powers appear capable of eternal progress, and that the higher endowments of man have such strength and beauty that they may be regarded as made for immortality.

When we are looking at this subject simply as a field for the display of logical acuteness, there may be a difficulty in deciding between opposing arguments. But when we come face to face with death, when the heart is wrung with the agony of bereavement, when we feel how hard it is to submit to see all our own progress and experience come to a sudden termination, the spontaneous verdict of our nature is, this earthly life is not the whole of our being. In this world we see that the Love of God provides for us all things that are for our good; we must believe therefore that the same Love will continue to give us what we need when we are no longer in this world; the universal feeling of mankind is a dread of annihilation, a wish to continue to exist, an aspiration, a hope, where it can be gained—an expectation, of a life to come. Moreover the great men of the world have encouraged us by their example to cherish such a faith. A similar certainty to that which they possessed is gained by every person who is truly religious, who has a felt communion with God. When we feel that God is with us and has a personal relation to us, when we know the joy of becoming one in spirit with the Infinite Father, we can rest assured that He will continue that communion eternally. That Socrates and Plato, Christ and Paul, and multitudes of prophets and martyrs, under different forms of faith, have believed in immortality is a presumption in its favour; but the crowning evidence and final proof, that which may expel all doubt and hesitation and leave a positive certainty, is the experience of the Love of God, the evidence—such as cannot be communicated to others, but is all-sufficient for him who feels it—thus granted of our own spiritual nature and worth, and of our consequent endless being.

Believing in human immortality, we can happily and confidently labour at whatever work in this world God has given us to do, we can bear without dismay the painful dispensations of His providence, we can be resigned under the stroke of bereavement; without this faith, we are ever sowing, seldom reaping, loving yet liable at any moment to loss for ever those whom we love, capable of growth but cut short in it, aiming at many objects and reaching few, beginning many a progress but completing none of them, with vast desires, endless aspirations, boundless capacities but only a span of existence, an exception in God's universe, the only one of his creations incapable of ever arriving at its perfect development. Such a negation all may well desire to escape from. Reason does not justify it, instinct protests against it, the heart disowns it, religion flatly contradicts it. It is a happy change, when any who have held it escape from it, and find their doubts removed and their difficulties met, so that they can receive and treasure, and practically make use of, the comforting, strengthening, and inspiring doctrine of the Immortality of Man.

Genius and Industry.—No one need pride himself upon genius, for it is the free gift of God; but of honest industry and true devotion to his destiny any man may well be proud; indeed, this thorough integrity of purpose is itself the divine idea in its most common form, and no really honest mind is without communion with God.—*Fichte.*

Digitized by Google

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

SEVENTH LESSON.

THE GREEK VERBS IN ω.

THE 1st Person, Present tense, Indicative mood, Active voice, of a Greek Verb, ends either in ω. or in μι. As λεγω, *I say;* ειμι, *I am.* And according to which it ends with, the Verb is named either *A Verb in* ω, or *A Verb in* μι;

We begin with Verbs in ω.

Verbs in ω are classified by the *letter* that stands next before the final ω; and this *letter* is called the Characteristic *letter;* (when the ending is πτω or κτω, the first consonant is called the Characteristic.) And the Characteristic is changed in different tenses.

The Future, adds an σ to the Present before the final ω; except in liquid verbs, which are those that have either λ, μ, ν, or ρ for Characteristic. (ψ and ξ seem exceptions, but they are not; for ψ is πς; and ξ is really κς, though not called so.)

Thus, αναπαυω, fut. αναπαυσω.
I give rest, I will give rest (line 2.)

Or, to show it more at length:—If we read from the Grammar, in the Indicative Mood,—first,

The Present Tense.

Sing.	τυπτ-ω	τυπτ-εις	τυπτ-ει
	I strike	thou strikest	he strikes
Dual,	...	τυπτ-ετον	τυπτ-ετον
		ye two strike	they two strike
Pl.	τυπτ-ομεν	τυπτ-ετε	τυπτ-ουσι
	we strike	you strike	they strike

And next, The Future Tense. I shall strike

τυψ-ω	τυψ-εις	τυψ-ει
	τυψ-ετον	τυψ-ετον
τυψ-ομεν	τυψ-ετε	τυψ-ουσι

we see the tense-endings are alike, but that the Characteristic letter πτ (used as a double letter), is changed in the Future into ψ (*ps.*)

The 1st Aorist copies the Future; not in the tense-endings, but in the Characteristic; and in any other change of spelling. And it copies it in every Mood, even in those that have no Future. Thus, from

Αιρω future Αρω.
I take I will take.

Αρατε, *take*, on line 3, we see is 2d person plural of the 1st Aorist [Imperative], because it has copied the Future in dropping the ι. Notice, Αιρω is a *liquid Verb*, its Characteristic is ρ, so there is no σ in the Future. Notice also that the 1st Aorist is the tense oftenest used in the Testament, or perhaps in any History; and the one we most need to recognise, (it is sometimes called the Historian's tense.)

Matthew xi. 28.

1 Δευτε προς με παντες οἱ κοπιωντες
Follow after me all the labouring
2 και πεφορτισμενοι, κἀγω αναπαυσω
& having been burdened, &-I will give rest-to
3 ὑμας. Αρατε τον ζυγον μου εφ'
you. Take the yoke of me upon
4 ὑμας, και μαθετε απ' εμου· ὁτι
you, and learn from me, for
5 πραος ειμι και ταπεινος τῃ καρδιᾳ·
meek I am and lowly in the heart;
6 και εὑρησετε αναπαυσιν ταις ψυχαις
and you shall find rest to the souls
7 ὑμων. Ὁ γαρ ζυγος μου χρηστος,
of you, the For yoke of me easy,
8 και το φορτιον μου ελαφρον εστιν.
and the burden of me light is.

THE ACCENTS.

The question of accents is discussed by the learned, and we, the unlearned, can only listen. But we are told that the accents are only a later addition to the text, and must be taken only as a commentary, and not relied on. And that, in any doubtful case, the context alone must decide the meaning of the sentence.

Digitized by Google

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

DISCIPLINE.

A paper was read on the subject of Sunday School Discipline at a recent meeting of the Sunday School Association in London. The complaint was made that in our Sunday Schools discipline is in a very unsatisfactory state. From the discussion that followed there seemed a decided feeling in favour of having a kind of discipline established in our Sunday Schools like that to be seen in a well conducted day school; and to secure this, measures were recommended for dealing with the most refractory scholars. Here again day school methods were recommended; there were none in favour of beating, but for expulsion there were several reasons set forth, such as for the good of the school, and to prevent the offender from contaminating the other children. There was a difference of opinion with respect to expelling a child. The ground of objection with those who would not approve of expulsion was the case of the child who is proposed to be thus treated. One speaker had known a child expelled from a Sunday School who had at length been transported. What is to become of the child that is known to be in an unhealthy moral state, who is turned from a professedly Christian institution as incurable? No one is compelled to open a Sunday School, nor to identify it with Christianity; but if he does, surely it is Christ's rule that must be obeyed, and Christ's example that ought to be followed. The parable of the lost sheep teaches us that it would be better to neglect ninety and nine tolerably well behaved children than help to make an outcast of one little child, whose early years may have been blighted by vice, and who, nevertheless, had an inclination to come to a school avowedly carried on in the spirit of Jesus Christ. It is well to have discipline in the school, but it is a secondary thing. Soldiers march together like clockwork, and are valuable for some purposes; but how often do we see those who, when under an imposed discipline are so true and certain in their behavour and attention, when the authority of their officers is removed, seem unable in many cases to act on their own behalf. Very important is it for Teachers to find out the facts of the case of their scholars; to know their homes, their parents, the influences that surround them. Our Sunday Schools are often conducted upon theory. Take the giving of prizes, about which some remarks were made at this meeting. A child with good, careful parents is always punctual, perhaps is naturally dull and sleepy, and consequently does not misbehave, he gets a prize. Another boy, who perhaps has been often late, and perhaps hungry—we have heard of boys coming to Sunday School without breakfast—cannot sit still, especially during forced attendance at the service, he does not get a prize. These are facts which are totally ignored under the system of prize giving. Let our Sunday School Teachers remember the serious responsibility that rests upon them when they go to meet a class of children who now are willing to be taught—willing to be improved, but who, in ten years more, may not be within the influence of Christian service. Let them not rely upon the superintendent's frown, or the bad mark, or the prize, or the threat of having one of those immortal beings turned into the street; but rather let them aim at the hearts that perhaps have never been touched with the sense of God's nearness, or of the voice of conscience, or have never known the earnest desire to seek after the grace of God. The reform we need is in our Teachers, and in recognising the vast opportunities for doing good that are placed in our hands. We are less anxious about statistics—about the great percentage of attendance, or of mechanical precision in movement and sound during the school hour, than we are that the minds of Teachers and supporters should be fixed upon the one great work of doing, in our day and generation, the work of Christ.

NOTES OF PROGRESS.

THE meeting of The British and Foreign Unitarian Association, held in May, was reported fairly in the *Daily News;* and in the *Christian World,* after apologising somewhat for noticing Unitarians, a writer gives a fair account of the annual gathering. In the *Christian World* supplement, the sermon of the Rev. Athanase Coquerel of Paris is printed, and announced as one of "the nine great sermons of the month."

BELFAST.

A second Mission-station is talked of here; and considering the wealth and numbers of our body in Belfast and vicinity, there should be no difficulty in making the scheme a success.

We are glad to learn that Dr Ritchie, J.P., is about to build a new school for Mount Pottinger district. Mr Robert M'Calmont, aided by a few devoted workers, has conducted a Sunday School at Mount Pottinger for a lengthened period. The good work has gone on slowly but steadily, and now there is a flourishing school, an excellent staff of teachers, and a good library. Here is the nucleus of a congregation. No quarter of the town is better fitted for a Mission-station than this; and when the new school is opened, we hope to hear of regular preaching being established.

A new school and lecture room, in connection with the second congregation, will shortly be erected, at a cost of upwards of £1000. A course of Sunday evening lectures is being delivered. Rev. W. Gaskell gave one on "Some strong points of Unitarian Christianity." The church was crowded.

The York Street congregation (Rev. J. Jellies') is in such a flourishing condition that a new church will ere long be needed to accommodate the members. This fact is surely encouraging.

Erratum.—In our Notes of Progress last month it was stated that £700 were subscribed at a preliminary meeting for a larger chapel at Monton,—it should have been £7000.

REVIEWS.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED EXAMINED. A Discourse by the Rev. J. Scott Porter. Belfast: W. H. Greer, High Street. London: E. T. Whitfield & Co., 178 Strand.

The famous Creed, erroneously ascribed to Athanasius, has of late occupied a large share of public attention. The two Houses of Convocation in England have had lengthened debates on it. The Irish Episcopal Synod has had it under discussion. The religious newspapers, of all shades of opinion, have devoted no little space to considerations thereupon. Even the secular press has had something to say on the matter. Nearly everybody has heard of the Creed. But it may be doubted if everybody has read it or examined it. Those who wish to read the Creed, and a searching examination of it, should procure Mr Porter's discourse. Though we are destined for some time longer to be consigned thirteen times a year to perdition by the clergymen who read the incomprehensible Athanasian Creed, we may be comforted by the thought that it is opposed to enlightened public opinion, and this timely and vigorous utterance by Mr Scott Porter will serve to hasten the extinction of the cursing Creed.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF SATAN. Edited by John R. Beard, D.D., Author of The People's Dictionary of the Bible. Williams & Norgate, London. 7s. 6d.

The popular idea of a Satan we regard as not only false but mischievous. We know that there are those who, though doubting the fact of the personality of a devil, think that there are good grounds for not leading the world to doubt in its existence—ignorantly trusting that to frighten children and others with a personal enemy is one way to encourage virtue and religion.

The earnest orthodox teacher does not scruple to repeat assertions about the operations of this remnant of Paganism which it would be impossible for him to prove; and no doubt little children and others are terrified with the picture their imaginations are led to present to them. There is another remarkable fact connected with this Satan superstition, and that is, the making of amusement out of references to it. We listened a short time ago to an orthodox minister of Dundee, who succeeded in making a large audience very merry in describing a legend which told how a preacher once succeeded in shutting the devil up in his snuff-box. What would the orthodox do sometimes for amusement if they could not introduce some anecdote of an adventure with the devil?

These two positions seem to us to destroy each other. If there is a devil, terrible in its relation to human-kind, worse than small-pox, or fever, or cholera, then no one would ever laugh about it. If, on the other hand, men who believe in the orthodox position can call this devil names which are sure to excite laughter and merriment, we conclude that they really regard the devil, not as a fearful fiend, but as a stupid clown, and therefore no devil at all.

We welcome Dr Beard's exhaustive work. He has succeeded in presenting an interesting history of the rise, progress, and decay of the devil mythology.

THE UNITARIAN ARGUMENT, In some leading points, RE-STATED and EXPLAINED. By Charles F. Biss. London: H. Brace, 178 Strand. 1s 6d; five copies, post free, 6s.

This work is suited for giving inquirers a general acquaintance with the Unitarian position.

RATIONAL CHRISTIANITY, a searching and fearless investigation. By a Rational Christian. Second edition, Revised. Price 1s. London: Hall & Co., Paternoster Row.

OUTLINES OF SERMONS, taken chiefly from the published works of Unitarian Writers. London: John Russell Smith, 36 Soho Square. 3s 6d.

The editor of these outlines has presented us with the results of a great amount of reading and study, and has given the marrow of many sermons and lectures which, in their original form, offered little inducement to the busy man or woman, overwhelmed with the literature of the day, to read them for themselves.

The outlines are divided into short sections with suitable headings. The volume contains an instructive Table of Dates relating to the History of Religious Reformation from B.C. 1300, when Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt, down to 1871, when we have "Unitarian worship opened at Milan."

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

No. 8. AUGUST 1872. PRICE 1D.

THE CASE OF THE REV. W. KNIGHT OF DUNDEE.

WE have to lay before our readers on this occasion an account of proceedings that have taken place in Dundee, the importance of which to the cause of pure Christianity cannot be well overstated. Those who have lived for a time in the midst of the associations of Calvinism learn how few are the indications presented by consistent members of the orthodox churches of a willingness to recognise, as worthy of kindly consideration, those who venture to follow the dictates of their own judgment in matters of theological belief. Of course, the simplest method is to treat with scornful contempt persons who seek to worship the God of their fathers after the way some call heresy. The prosecution of the Unitarian cause in Dundee has not met with any organised opposition from the orthodox churches hitherto,—certain public halls have been refused for Unitarian lectures, but beyond this little has been done. The discussion upon the merits of Unitarian Christianity has now been commenced through the conduct of one of the recognised orthodox ministers of Dundee, who, while on a visit to London recently, accepted of a friendly invitation from the Rev. James Martineau to preach in Little Portland Street Chapel. The first part of the service was conducted by Mr Martineau, the Rev. Mr Knight of Dundee preached and pronounced the benediction. It appears that some elders of a Scotch Presbyterian Church in London attended this service, and brought the word to Edinburgh. Mr Knight is a Presbyterian minister. Our English readers will need to be informed that Presbyterian means something different in Scotland from what the term does in several English towns where Presbyterian is the same as Unitarian. In Dundee there are four different kinds of Presbyterians, and the term Presbytery is applied to an association of ministers and laymen who have signed certain forms,—just as a man who joins a trades' union signs the bye-laws, or an apprentice his indentures. The man who would be recognised as a Presbyterian minister, or an elder, or deacon, must sign the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. A minister must also answer certain questions, such as the following:—"Do you disown all Popish, Arian, Socinian, Arminian, Erastian, and other doctrines, tenets, and opinions whatsoever contrary to and inconsistent with the Westminster Confession of Faith?" Then the candidate for the ministry must also subscribe "I promise that I shall follow no devisive course from the doctrine, worship, discipline, government, and exclusive jurisdiction of this church, renouncing all doctrines and opinions whatsoever contrary to, or inconsistent with, the said doctrine, worship, &c., of the same." Notwithstanding this, Mr Knight found it not inconsistent with his sense of right

Digitized by Google

conduct to preach, in Mr Martineau's pulpit, a sermon which he had already preached to his own congregation in Dundee. His Presbyterian brethren became alarmed at this apparent recognition of Mr Martineau and his congregation as not altogether outcasts. He was, soon after his return, invited to explain his conduct to the Presbytery. After a stormy discussion as to whether the proceedings should be in public or confined to the Presbytery, it was resolved to meet in secret. But, expecting that he would have made his defence in public, Mr Knight had sent the address he was to deliver to the newspapers. In it he asserts that there is no law in the church which forbids his conduct. He says, "I hope no one will imagine that my act was one, the significance of which I had not duly weighed, or that in performing it I was not following out my highest convictions of duty." He expresses his high admiration for Mr Martineau, and asserts that Mr Martineau and his congregation knew that he appeared as a Trinitarian; but he considers the articles of belief on which Mr Martineau and he are at one quite as important as those on which they differ. There is special pleading in the address, but this arises, we suppose, mainly from the necessity which was laid upon Mr Knight of justifying his conduct to those who are less sympathetic than he for those who honestly differ from them in theological opinions. We certainly regret this.

At another meeting of the Presbytery, there were long addresses delivered denouncing Unitarianism and Unitarians, and, as is usually the case, Unitarians were accused of doing and believing very objectionable things. If Mr Knight had gone into Mr Martineau's pulpit and had preached from the forged text, 1 John v. 7, which is still printed among the proofs of the Shorter Catechism, and had distinctly told the people there assembled that they were on their way to perdition—that their minister was leading them farther and farther from the path of life,—if then the congregation had risen and tried to expel the preacher from the pulpit, and finally succeeded by calling in the "civil magistrates'" myrmidons, we suspect, from the tone of the addresses given at the last Presbytery meeting, Mr Knight would have been received with demonstrations of joy. But he did not do this; he believed he could spend a portion of his Sunday in London in Christian worship with men and women who were not able to accept of all those interpretations of the divine nature which the Confession of Faith contains. But underlying all these, there was—he appears to us to maintain—a broad common ground sufficient for them to stand upon for once at least, from which they might worship and commune with the source of all good. His brother Presbyters, repeating the old parrot cry, declare that the difference between Unitarianism and Trinitarianism is vital; that there is no possibility of their uniting in worship. Mr Knight has told them that he has done it, and that he is prepared to do it again. After a repetition of denunciations against Mr Knight's conduct, a resolution was passed "requiring of him repudiation of the Unitarian body as forming no part of the Church of Christ, and enjoining Mr Knight not to repeat the act under the pain of exposing himself to the highest censure of the church," and appointing a committee to confer with him, and report to the Presbytery.

Mr Knight said in reference to this, the motion proposes "that I should add something in reference to the denomination going under the name of Unitarian Christians; so far as that addition to our standards"—the Confession of Faith, &c.—"is concerned, I am not prepared to give any answer to it."

A letter from Mr Knight has since appeared in the leading newspapers of Dundee, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, in which he states that he can only confer with this committee on two conditions; the first is, "that they will consent to the presence of a reporter, who will preserve all *their* queries and all *my* answers to them;" the second is, "that they will formulate a distinct charge against me, showing wherein I have violated any law, and send me this charge previously, in writing."

Mr Knight indicates to us in these conditions the weakness and strength of his position. The weakness of his position, in our opinion, lies in his effort to take advantage of the absence of any law in the Free Church which has been broken by him. Does it need an outsider to point out that he stands alone in

Digitized by Google

the midst of his "brethren?" The qualified support afforded him by one brother is remarkable for its indefiniteness; and while he boldly relies upon the negative advantage he has in the church courts, he shows an impatience and positive unwillingness to meet those brethren in secret, and enable them to use whatever esoteric charms they may possess to bring him into harmony with them. We cannot think he will pursue this equivocal course.

The strength of Mr Knight's position is in the broad Catholic and eminently Christian spirit he presents. He wishes his conduct to be considered in public, because great consequences depend upon the immediate settlement of such a case as his. With a readiness which could hardly have been expected, the leading newspapers of Scotland have pronounced in his favor. It is said that the people generally approve of his conduct, and encourage him not to draw back. The claims of the Presbytery upon him are utterly ignored. Mr Knight is judged, not by the law of the church to which he belongs, but by the laws of common sense, and by an age which more and more repudiates the principle of the orthodox churches, that intellectual belief and not good conduct should form the ground of Christian fellowship. Mr Knight declares that he is a Trinitarian, we accept his statement; but he has refused to deny the name of Christian to Unitarians, and we gratefully thank him for his generous appreciation of those who differ from him on a point of theology, but who, he may rest sure, are at one with him in his efforts to place religion on a broader foundation than men, who arrogate to themselves the position of stewards of the Kingdom of God, have hitherto allowed.

The result so far seems to us to be, that now, in the minds of many people in Scotland, Unitarians have the right to call themselves Christians. The discussion, however, has not yet come to an end. If Mr Knight keeps firm he will most likely be expelled, just as Mr John Robertson of Coupar-Angus was. It is vain to attempt to put new wine into old bottles.

ON THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

THE notion of "birth sin" or inherent human depravity appears not to be so much a doctrine belonging to any particular religion as one of those exaggerations and excrescences of devotional feeling that break forth at various times and attach themselves to the religion of the day. The ancient Indian scriptures seem to teach that the soul of man is a ray of the divine spirit; but the modern Brahmin worshipper repeats in his daily ritual prayer "I am sin, I commit sin, my spirit is sinful, I am conceived in sin." The ancient Persian religious books teach very emphatically man's purity at his birth; the modern Parsee also continues to uphold the doctrine of original purity, and gets into many an argument with the English missionary at Bombay on a tenet so opposite to Evangelical orthodoxy. But that off-shoot of the Persian religion which, under the names of Gnosticism and Manichæism, spread its influence over Christianity in the early centuries, was heavily loaded with the doctrines of Original Sin and of man's inability to do right, and seems to have been one of those foreign causes that helped to build up our modern system of Calvinism. The Hebrew people, through many centuries, kept themselves free from notions so destructive of virtuous effort, and constantly taught man's power to turn from his sins to God. Jesus also preached repentance and renewal of life, and blessed little children, declaring that unto such belong the kingdom of heaven. But what is called Christianity in many of the churches around us has too often a different spirit of teaching. It is then particularly instructive to us Unitarian Christians who make it our endeavour to return to the original religion of the Scriptures, to take up this subject historically and to try to trace the first steps of the entrance and establishment among us of the doctrines of Calvinism.

About the year 400 A.D. a Welsh monk named Morgan, or Pelagius, as he called himself, putting a Greek translation on his name, after the fashion of his day, travelled to Rome, in company with his friend Celestius, an Irish monk. These two men seem to have had no opinions different from

Digitized by Google

those generally held at the time, but with strong good sense and some eloquence they set themselves to oppose the growing superstitions they met with, especially with respect to the efficacy of baptism to wash away sins, and maintained that good works and amendment of life are all that is necessary to procure from God the forgiveness of sin.

These doctrines do not appear to have given any offence in Rome, where they were even generally approved of; nor in Palestine, where Celestius carried on this preaching. But when his friend Pelagius proceeded to Africa, where the celebrated Augustine was bishop of the town of Hippo, he was presently drawn into a warm controversy upon the subject. Augustine professed himself shocked at the slight cast upon the sacrament of baptism, while Pelagius is said to have maintained that it is even possible for men, if they use their best endeavours, to live entirely without sin. This was the beginning of the Pelagian controversy, which had so large a share in forming the doctrines of original sin, grace, and predestination.

It does not appear that Augustine, when he began the dispute, had any notion whither it would carry him, nor how he would be led to exaggerate and to contradict his calmer opinions through zeal of opposing his adversary.

Before the controversy, in writing against the Manichæans, who said that some souls are necessarily wicked, he had asserted that every man has a power to do the will of God, and to make himself acceptable to him. But now, having to maintain that the purpose of baptism was to wash away sins, against Pelagius, whose strong argument was that it is given to infants who have no sins to be washed away by it, he said that they had *original sin*, a name and a thing unknown before among Christians. He went on to say that this sinfulness was derived from Adam, from whom they were descended, and that until it was taken away men had no power to do the will of God; the power to do right could come only by the gift of God, his grace imparted at baptism.

The case of children dying unbaptised was a difficulty to these theologians, since neither Augustine nor any persons of his time had imagined so shocking an idea as that a new-born babe should be condemned to hell fire for all eternity. In his earlier books Augustine had written that infants in a future state would have neither reward nor punishment, since they had done no actions that could deserve either. But now, having to support his new doctrine of Original Sin, he wrote that if they died unbaptised they could not escape going to hell, but that their punishment would be very slight.

Augustine's character throughout this controversy appears in a very ill light. His warm temper carried him further than a change of opinion could honestly justify, and he made no scruple of retracting much that he had lately affirmed, and of adopting many notions from the Manichæan Doctrine he had a little while ago been writing against. Thus, in his earlier writings, he had defined sin to be "the will to do that from which we have the power to abstain." But afterwards he contradicted his own definition by some false and quibbling explanations, and that he might cover the absurdity of the position he had taken up, he invented a new phrase, and said that the good works of the Heathen were only a kind of shining sins.

Augustine's influence over the clergy was uncontrolled, and it was seldom found safe to contradict him. He easily procured the opinions of Pelagius to be condemned by a Synod held at Carthage; but he could not prevent their spreading. The Pelagian doctrines continued to be approved at Rome, and the Pope himself was at the head of those that favoured them. Neither during his life-time nor for centuries afterwards did Augustine's opinions make any way. A sort of middle doctrine which got called Semi-Pelagianism was for a long time pretty generally received in the Christian Church.

Dr Priestley in some of the most interesting chapters of his history of the Corruptions of Christianity has given an account of this controversy between Augustine and Pelagius upon Original Sin, and the same work may be consulted for the further progress of this doctrine; first, in the ninth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, in the disputes among the schoolmen, and then again later under Luther and Calvin at the time of the Reformation, when it was perfected, and finally placed among the five points of Calvinism at the Council of Dort in 1618.

Digitized by Google

ORTHODOX DOCTRINES DENIED BY UNITARIANS.

By the Rev. JOHN WRIGHT, B.A., Bury.

No. 4.—THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

ALL orthodox Christians believe that Christ is God and offer prayer to him. Unitarians deny that Christ is God and pray only to the Father.

The means we possess of knowing what is the truth about Christ is principally the four gospels, and especially the words of Christ himself therein contained. We find it recorded in the gospels that he was born, grew, was subject to his parents, was hungry and thirsty, was weary and slept, was tempted and prayed, was sorrowful and wept, suffered, bled, and died. Can he then be God? Can the Being who is ever-existent and unchangeable be born and die? Can Infinite Perfection experience hunger and thirst and weariness? If God prays, to whom can He pray? The disciples asked Jesus "Teach us to pray." His answer was, "When ye pray, say Our Father." If he were God, why did he not reply, "Pray to me?" Do Trinitarians suppose that Christ did not know how we should pray, or that knowing he did not choose to give full and correct instruction? Unless they suppose this, why are they not satisfied to follow his directions, without adding prayers to himself? Peter, when asked by Christ, "Whom say ye that I am?" answered, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God;" and Christ highly commended the answer. Would he have done so if the true reply had been, "Thou art God the Son," as Trinitarians teach at the present day? Christ said, "I can of mine own self do nothing." Is this true if he is God? Christ said "All power is *given* unto me;" "My Father is greater than I;" "The Father which sent me, he *gave me a commandment;*" these and many similar passages are totally inconsistent with the belief that he is God, who is greater than all.

The answer usually made to such statements as the above is, that Trinitarians admit the humanity of Christ, but also assert his Deity, saying that in him the two natures were united. But how can the same being be at once the Creator and the created, the sender and the sent, the worshipper and the object of worship, Infinite yet born and dying, perfect yet tempted, unchangeable yet changing, God and at the same time man? The doctrine is so entirely self-contradictory that no reasonable man can explain it, and its advocates are compelled to call it a mystery. In whatever respects Christ was man, he was not God; and in whatever respects he was God, he was not man. Suppose a person was to claim to be at once king and subject, and to assert that some of his acts were justified on the ground that they were such as become the monarch, and that others of his acts were justified because though wrong for the monarch they were permissible in a private man. The answer would be—"You cannot be at once both ruler and ruled," and such an attempt at self-defence would be condemned as a dishonest quibble. Is then what would be acknowledged as an abuse of language in worldly affairs to be tolerated in theology? As soon can we grant the same thing to be at once black and white, as the same being to be at once God and man.

But the Trinitarian says he has proof from the Bible that Christ is God; let us then look at this proof. So important a doctrine we shall except to find clearly stated in the gospels. We have in them about 500 texts in which Jesus is spoken of as inferior to God. What texts have we in them in which he is said to be God? The following are sometimes quoted as such.

1. *Matt. viii.* 2, *ix.* 18 and others, in which it is mentioned that persons "worshipped Jesus." It has been argued that he would not have permitted this unless he were God. But the Greek word translated "worship," as well as the word "worship" itself at the time our translation of the Bible was made, signifies

Digitized by Google

simply "to bow before" or "do reverence." In proof of this, see *Matt. xviii.* 26, *Luke xiv.* 10, where it is applied to human beings. So in the marriage service of the church, the bridegroom says to his bride, "With my body I thee worship"—and the mayor of a corporate town is called "his worship." These examples prove that the word "worship" does not in the Bible necessarily suppose religious homage, such as we pay to God.

2. *Matt. i.* 23. The name Emmanuel is given to Christ, which means "God with us." But many of the Jews had such names, as Eli, meaning my God; Elijah, meaning God the Lord. We do not conclude that those who bore these names were God; neither can we conclude anything of the kind concerning Christ from the use of the name Emmanuel.

3. *John i.* 1—18. This is the passage most relied on by Trinitarians in proof of the Deity of Christ. Space will not allow me to give an explanation of it at length. It is enough to state that there is no proof that "the word" in verses 1 to 13 means Christ, to explain it as signifying the power and influence of God giving a clear meaning to the passage. Such was the meaning with which this and similar phrases were used in the age in which this gospel was written. Verse 14 is the first verse of the passage that refers to Christ, and it describes him as "the word made flesh"—that is, the power of God manifested in human form; but this is a very different thing from saying that Christ is God. If it were intended in this passage to state the Deity of Christ, it is strange that the same is not taught throughout this gospel, and that there are in it so many texts conveying the opposite doctrine. See *John iii.* 34, *iv.* 23, *v.* 19, *v.* 30, *x.* 33—36, *xiv.* 28.

4. *John xx.* 28. "Thomas said unto him, my Lord and my God." Does this prove that Christ is God? We cannot suppose the apostle who had just before been incredulous to be the best authority on the subject, nor an exclamation of awe and wonder to be a legitimate theological argument. But supposing it were, we find, *I. Sam. xx.* 12, "Jonathan said unto David, O Jehovah, God of Israel," showing that these words were often used by the Jews in an inferior meaning to that in which we use them.

5. *John x.* 30. "I and my Father are one." The sense in which Jesus uses these words is shown by *John xvii.* 11, in which he prays that his disciples may be one as his Father and he are one, that is evidently in will and purpose not in essence.

Such are the principal texts in the gospels relied on to prove the Deity of Christ. There is not one that presents even an appearance of such a doctrine in the first three gospels, not one that may not be explained in accordance with the Unitarian doctrine in the fourth. There are texts on the other side in almost every chapter of every gospel:

The arguments derived from the rest of the New Testament, to prove that Christ is God, are these:—

1. The early disciples prayed to Christ, as Stephen, *Acts vii.* 59; but the word "God" in this verse is inserted by the Translators, and should be omitted, as is shown by the way in which it is printed. Stephen has a vision, and declares he sees Jesus, but it is not as God, but as "the son of man standing on the right hand of God." He therefore naturally addresses his master whom he thus sees. His example is no rule to us unless we in like manner have a vision of Jesus in a glorified state. Moreover, such invocation is not prayer.

2. *Acts xx.* 28. The word Lord should here be substituted for God, the former having the preponderance of critical support. To talk of the blood of God is manifestly absurd.

3. *Romans ix.* 5. "God who is over all be blessed for ever," is the translation approved of by many learned Trinitarians, and no one can deny that this may be the meaning of the text, which is therefore not a conclusive argument in favour of the Deity of Christ. The general meaning is, "of whom Christ came, thank God for it."

4. *I. Tim. iii.* 16. "God was manifest in the flesh." Sir Isaac Newton has proved beyond doubt that all the churches for the first 400 or 500 years, and all the ancient versions read "Great is the mystery of godliness, *which* (not God) was manifest in the flesh." The method of writing in the Greek manuscripts caused one stroke to alter the one reading into the other.

5. *Hebrews i.* 3, may be translated, "God is thy throne for ever and ever;"

Digitized by Google

the next verse shows most clearly that Jesus is not God, for it says to him, "God, even thy God, hath anointed thee."

6. *I. John v.* 20. "This is the true God." The word "this" is often supposed here to refer to Christ, but that it does not is shown by Christ being twice spoken of in this very verse as "the Son of God," and by *John xvii.* 3, where Christ addresses the Father as "the ONLY true God." "This" refers therefore to Him whom Christ hath revealed.

7. *Col. ii.* 9. "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." The meaning of this expression is shown by *Eph. iii.* 19, where the apostle wishes for his disciples "that ye might be filled with the fulness of God." Nothing is here said of Christ therefore that may not also be said of Christians in general.

The result of this examination of the teachings of Scripture is that the texts which seem to speak of Christ as God admit of a different explanation, while those which speak of him as inferior to God are so plain and positive that they cannot be mistaken. There is not one word of the teachings of Christ himself that can be said to teach us to pray to him. There is nothing told of him in the gospels that would induce us to suppose him to be the Deity. The texts in the epistles that are quoted in proof of his being God are few in number, and doubtful as to their meaning.

Unitarians do not pray to Christ, or speak of Christ, as God,—I. because to do so is inconsistent with all that we are told of Christ in the gospels; II. because it is opposed to his own express injunctions, "when ye pray, say Our Father"—"ye shall ask me nothing;" III. because it is inconceivable that there can be in *one* person *two* natures, or that the same being at the same time can be God and man; IV. because there is no text in the Bible which teaches that Christ is God, in words so plain and certain as to admit of no other explanation; V. because we can be Christians—that is, disciples of Christ—without praying to him. Unitarians try to show their discipleship to Christ according to his own instructions, "by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." "If ye love me, keep my commandments." They do not reject or deny Christ, but look upon him as they sincerely believe he teaches them to look, and they give him the love and reverence and obedience which they conceive are all he desires from his followers. But they shrink from ascribing to Jesus titles, or offering to him prayers, which they think belong only to the ONE GOD, whom Jesus himself called "my Father and your Father, my God and your God," lest they should thus be guilty of worshipping the creature to the neglect of the Creator.

Let those who speak of Christ as God, ask themselves, "what warrant have we for this language in the teachings of Christ?" His words are "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, *the only true God*, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."

EASTERN MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.

THE idle habits which are brought on by the warmth of the climate, and into which the wealthy Arabs sometimes fall, is described in Proverbs xxvi. 15:

> The slothful man hideth his hand in the dish;
> It wearieth him to bring it to his mouth again.

Such a man sits on his sofa, perhaps smoking, with his servant at a little distance waiting his pleasure. If he wants anything, he is too idle even to speak; he makes a sign with his hand. When a message has been brought to a Turkish Governor, about a criminal who has been taken he has been known to make a slight horizontal motion of his hand, which has been well understood to mean, Cut his head off. And this has been done accordingly. The ladies give their orders to their maids in the same idle way. Hence it is the duty of the servant to watch the hand for these signs. So the Psalmist says,

> So, as servants' eyes are on the hand of their masters,
> As a maiden's eyes are on the hand of her mistress,
> So our eyes shall be on Jehovah our God.
> (Psalm cxxiii.)

A treacherous man will even give orders to his servant in hostility to the friend who is sitting on the same sofa with him; as the Book of Proverbs says,

> A man of sin, an evil one, walketh with froward mouth.
> He winketh with his eyes, he speaketh with his feet,
> He giveth orders with his fingers.
> Fraud is in his heart, he deviseth mischief.
> (Proverbs vi., 12-14.)

Digitized by Google

JONAH AND THE WHALE.

WHO was the author of the Book of Jonah we cannot tell. That it was not written by the Prophet himself is obvious from the most casual regard of its language, for the third person singular is used throughout, and never the first person singular; it is never once said *I* did so and so, and such a thing happened to *me*, but *he* did so and so, and such a thing happened to *him*. The title Jonah is accordingly placed at the head of the work, not because it was written *by* Jonah, but because it treats *of* Jonah; but the name of the real writer has been lost beyond all hope of recovery.

The next question which arises (on the solution of which mainly depends the view we are to take of the nature and object of the book) is as to the date of its composition, as to the time or period in which it was written; and the most eminent Biblical Critics (such as Dr Samuel Davidson in his invaluable "Introduction to the Old Testament,") have arrived at the conclusion that it was penned towards the end of the Jewish Captivity in Babylon. They fortify this position by an appeal to the fact that the Book contains many *Chaldaisms*, in other words Chaldaic or Babylonian phrases and forms of expression. The Jews were conquered by Nebuchadnezzar and carried into captivity to Babylon about the year 606 B.C., and remained there in exile for some seventy years, till Cyrus gave them permission to return to their native land, and to re-build the Temple. Living so long in Babylon, they acquired the language of their conquerors so completely that they carried it back with them to Judea, where it became the common speech of their daily life, their own original Hebrew continuing to be the language used in books and in their public religious services. This fact is remarkably apparent in such of the Prophets as lived and wrote during, or shortly after, the Captivity; thus, in Jeremiah and Ezra there are whole verses, and in Daniel there are whole chapters, in the Chaldaic or Babylonish language. Hence, when learned men, who understand the ancient tongues, agree in declaring that any book in the Bible contains many Chaldaisms, that fact is of itself sufficient evidence that such book must have been composed either during or after the Captivity;—such accordingly was the date of the composition of the Book of Jonah.

The prophet Jonah flourished during the reign of Jeroboam, King of Israel—*i.e.*, between 825 B.C., and 784 B.C., and the decree of Cyrus, which put an end to the Captivity in Babylon, was issued in 536 B.C., so that the Book of Jonah cannot have had any existence till nearly three centuries after the events it professes to record,—a fact which goes far to show that it is *not historical.*

A very striking confirmation of both these conclusions, as to the late origin of the Book, and as to its unhistorical character, may be found in the very curious fact, that nearly every sentence of Jonah's Prayer in the second chapter, said to have been offered up "out of the fish's belly," *is a quotation from one or other of the Psalms!* Let me establish this by placing some of the parallel passages side by side:—

Jonah, ch. ii.	Psalms.
v. 2. "I cried by reason of mine affliction unto Jehovah, and He heard me."	cxx. 1. "In my distress I cried unto Jehovah, and He heard me."
v. 3. "All Thy billows and Thy waves passed over me."	xlii. 7. "All Thy waves and Thy billows are gone over me."
v. 5. "The waters compassed me about, even to the soul."	lxix. 1. "Save me, O God, for the waters are come in unto my soul."
v. 9. "I will sacrifice unto Thee with the voice of thanksgiving; I will pay that I have vowed."	cxvi. 17-18. "I will offer to Thee the sacrifice of thanksgiving . . I will pay my vows unto Jehovah."
v. 9. "Salvation is of Jehovah."	iii. 8. "Salvation belongeth unto Jehovah."

According to the best Commentators of the five Psalms here referred to, no less than four, viz., cxx., xlii., lxix., and cxvi., were written either during or immediately after the Babylonish Captivity, and consequently cannot have been quoted by the Prophet nearly three centuries before they were penned. In other words, this precise prayer could not possibly have ever been spoken by Jonah; so that this portion of the story is not only not historical, but perhaps was never intended to be so considered.

But if one portion of the narrative, the portion which tends most to edification, cannot be regarded as literal fact, why should any of the other portions be so

Digitized by Google

regarded? especially why should the tremendously extravagant and totally incredible supernatural machinery introduced be regarded as literal fact? why not look upon the whole Book not as history but as fable? why not deem it a *moral fiction*, a lengthened *Parable*, designed to inculcate some important lessons concerning the mercy and impartiality of God, and thereby to urge on us the resulting duty of an enlarged and enlightened charity, especially to those of other lands and of other faiths? That such is the true character, and that such is the real object of this very unartistic narrative, I have myself not the shadow of a doubt. The great truth it desires to enforce is this,—that the interest, the compassion, nay, the very love of the Most High are not restricted to the inhabitants of any one nation, or to the professors of any one religion; but include those of every country and of every creed in their universal operation. This was a lesson which the old Hebrews required to be taught, both with a special clearness, and with a special earnestness. They were but too apt to fancy that Jehovah was their own benefactor merely; that His affection was centered on them alone; and that He either hated, or at the very least was indifferent to all who were not descended from Abraham, and all who had not been favoured with the instructions of Moses. To cleanse their hearts of this insane prejudice, to purify their souls from this intense bigotry, appears to have been the leading design of the *Moral Tale* entitled "Jonah;" for we must remember that the inhabitants of Nineveh had no knowledge of the only true Object of Worship, but homaged "God's many and Lord's many," the embodiments of their own weaknesses and sins; that they prostrated themselves before idols of wood, or stone, or metal, in form horrible, or lascivious, or grotesque; that they served them with rites which were absurd, or cruel, or bestial; and yet it was *they* whom the Almighty warned, and pitied, and pardoned, and spared! Can any illustration be more affecting or more convincing of the boundlessness of His "loving-kindness and tender mercies?"

R. E. B. MACLELLAN.

WHAT IS MEANT BY END OF THE WORLD?

Exposition by ABEL C. THOMAS of America.

THE phrase END OF THE WORLD occurs seven times in the New Testament, namely, Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 20, 1 Corinthians x. 11, Hebrews ix. 26. It is generally supposed to signify the period of the dissolution of the material world. Is this the scriptural import of the phrase? In order to answer this question satisfactorily, let us examine all the passages above noted.

In 1 Corinthians x., the apostle refers to the wilderness history of the Israelites, and mentions the judgments which befel the murmurers, idolaters, and the like sinners, among that people. He then subjoins, verse 11, "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and *they are written for our admonition;* upon whom THE ENDS OF THE WORLD *are come.*" What world was it, or rather what worlds were they (for the noun is plural in the original), the ends of which came on the primitive Christians? Plainly, they were the eras or ages which preceded the establishment of the Christian era or age. Paul and his co-workers lived in the winding up of those eras; and hence the expression, ends of the worlds.

In Hebrews ix., the writer institutes a comparison between the office of the high priests under the law of Moses and the priesthood of Christ. He shows that those priests made frequent atonement, namely, once a year; and states concerning Christ, that it was not necessary for him to "offer himself often;.....for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world, [*kosmos*, the material world;] but now once in THE END OF THE WORLD hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men [the high priests referred to] once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many:"—That is, And AS it was appointed unto the high priests, under the law, to make atonement once every year, Exodus xxx. 10; not with their own blood, but with the blood of beasts, Heb. ix. 19; and after this atonement, the judgment or verdict of the

Digitized by Google

Lord as to its acceptance; SO Christ was once offered, not once every year, as in the case of the high priests under the law, but once for all, Heb. x. 10; nor with blood of others, but with his own blood, ix. 12. And this one offering of Christ was made in *the end of the world.* What *world* was it, or rather what *worlds* were they (for the noun is plural in the original), in the end of which Jesus was offered on the cross? Plainly, the reference is to the same eras or ages mentioned in the preceding instance.

The disciples asked our Lord, in a private interview "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of THE END OF THE WORLD?" They thus inquired for *the sign* of events to happen at the same time. In the reply of our Saviour, he spake *thrice* of THE END, namely, the end of the world inquired for, verses 6, 13, 14; and he assured them that this end would be "immediately after the tribulation of those days," verse 29, namely the tribulation of Jerusalem and the Jewish people, verse 21; and he farther certified them, that all these things should transpire before the close of that generation, though of the precise day and hour he could not inform them, verses 32—36. And that this sign applied not merely to the end of the world (or Jewish era), but also to the second coming of the Son of man, may be learned by consulting Matt. x. 16—23, xvi. 27, 28, xxiv. 30, &c.——We see that in this instance, as in the two instances before noted, the end of the world signified the end of the era of the law. That era was rapidly drawing to a close in the days of our Saviour, and it was entirely closed when the chief city of Judaism was destroyed—for the temple was razed to its foundation in the ruin of the city, and Jerusalem was trodden under foot of the Gentiles.

Our Saviour, in instructing his disciples to go forth and preach the gospel, promised to be with them alway, even unto THE END OF THE WORLD, Matt. xxviii. 20. There is a sense in which Jesus is present with all his disciples in every age and clime; but in the cited language he promised his disciples a *special* presence until the end of the Jewish era.....

We have thus considered four of the passages in which the phrase in question occurs. The remaining three places are found in Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49. In the exposition of the parable of the tares, our Saviour said, "The harvest is THE END OF THE WORLD.....As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in THE END OF THIS WORLD. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a *furnace of fire.*" In the parable of the net, we find the same sentiment: "So shall it be at THE END OF THE WORLD: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire." It is worthy of note that the word translated world, in the sentence, "the field is the world," verse 38, is KOSMOS, meaning the material world; whereas the word translated world, in the phrase "end of the world," is AION, meaning era or age.

Is *the end of the world* mentioned thrice in the parables of the tares of the field and net, the same as that noted in the preceding cases? The presumption is certainly in the affirmative, for the phrase is the same. But there are some reasons which might be assigned for a different sense. These shall be considered.

"The furnace of fire." What was there, in the destruction of Jerusalem, to comport with this idea? I answer, in the language of Isaiah, xxxi. 9: "And he shall pass over to his strong-hold for fear, and his princes shall be afraid of the Ensign, saith the Lord, whose *fire is in Zion*, and HIS FURNACE IN JERUSALEM." Also read Ezekiel xxii. 18—22: "Son of man, the house of Israel is to me become dross;.....behold, therefore, I will gather you *into the midst of Jerusalem.* As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it; so will I gather you in mine anger," &c.....

Of what we have written, this is the sum: In the winding up of the worlds or eras which preceded Christianity, Jesus offered himself on the cross, Heb. ix. 26. The ends of those worlds or eras came upon Paul and his brethren of the primitive church, 1 Cor. x. 11. The "end of the civil polity and ecclesiastical state" of the Jews, in the destruction of their city and temple, was the end of the world, or Jewish era, the sign of which was inquired for by the disciples, Matt. xxiv. 3. Our Saviour promised to be with them until that period, Matt. xxviii. 20. At that period, the separation noted in the parable of the net, and in the exposition of the parable of the tares, took place, Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49. Whoso readeth, let him understand.

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

EIGHTH LESSON.

TO LOOK OUT VERBS IN THE DICTIONARY.

THE dictionary gives a Greek Verb, spelt in the 1st person of the Present tense, Indicative mood; and adds to this the ending of the 1st person of the Future; thus,

λεγω, ξω, *I say*,

(read λεγω, *I say*, λεξω, *I shall say*);

and when the Verb is regular, you are supposed to know, with the help of the grammar, the whole of the other tenses from these two samples. Therefore, whatever tense we happen to want the English of, we must change its spelling into the 1st person Present, Indicative, to be able to look it out in the dictionary; and for this, besides the tense-endings, we must also study the changes which a Verb makes at the beginning of some of its tenses. These are, first, an *Augment*, or increase to some tenses. Next, a *Reduplication*, or doubling the first syllable of others. Thirdly, the *Augment and Reduplication both*, to some tenses. First, then,

THE AUGMENT.

When a Verb begins with a consonant, *the Augment* is the letter ε added at the beginning, of both Aorist tenses, both Pluperfects, and the Imperfect, in the Indicative mood; as

Present, λεγω, I say, 2d Aorist, ε-λεγον, I said,

If we want the English of ελεγον, we alter the tense-ending ον into ω, and cut off the Augment ε, and look out λεγω, and we find *I say*. Then we look in the grammar for the exact word ελεγον, and we find it 1st person singular and 3d person plural, in the Imperfect, and 2d Aorist, and we choose the one that makes the sense in the sentence which we would translate.

If the Verb begins with a vowel, the Augment is made by lengthening the vowel thus, ε into η; α into η; ο into ω, thus,

Present, ακουω, I hear, 1st Aorist, ηκουσα. I heard.

Remember, the Augment is only in the Indicative mood, and if we meet one of the past tenses in some other mood, the Augment is not there. Thus, with the irregular Verb—

Present, ερχομαι, I come, 2d Aorist, ηλθον, I came,

look at ελθετω, *let come*, the 2d Aorist Imperative in the Lord's Prayer [Lesson 6, line 3], the η of the Augment is not there.

THE REDUPLICATION.

In any Verb beginning with a consonant the Reduplication is an extra syllable made of the first letter of the word, and the letter ε added to the beginning of both the Perfect and both the Pluperfect tenses, in every mood; making τε or λε, or βε, &c., according to each particular Verb, thus,

Present.	Perfect Passive Participle.	
γραφω, I write,	γε-γραμ-μενος. having been written.	[line 4],

Remember the Reduplication is in every mood.

TABLE showing the Augment, and Reduplication; and some of the Changes in the Characteristic Letter.

	Augment.	Reduplication.	Characteristic Letter.	Tense-ending.	
Present,			τυ - πτ	- ω	I strike.
Imperfect,	ε -		- τυ - πτ	- ον	I was striking.
2d Aorist,	ε -		- τυ - π	- ον	I struck.
1st Perfect,		τε	- τυ - φ	- α	I have struck.
2d Perfect,		τε	- τυ - π		
1st Pluperfect,	ε -	τε	- τυ - φ	- ειν	I had struck.
2d Pluperfect,	ε -	τε	- τυ - π		
1st Aorist,	ε -		- τυ - ψ	- α	I struck.
Future,			τυ - ψ	- ω	I shall strike.

Digitized by Google

1 Corinthians xv. 54.

1 Ὅταν δε το φθαρτον τουτο ενδυσηται
when And the - corruptible - this may have put on

2 αφθαρσιαν, και το θνητον τουτο
incorruption, and the - mortal - this

3 ενδυσηται αθανασιαν, τοτε γενησεται
may have put on immortality, then shall come to pass

4 ὁ λογος ὁ γεγραμμενος· Κατεποθη
the word the having been written; Was swallowed up

5 ὁ θανατος εις νικος.
the death in victory.

6 Που σου, θανατε το κεντρον;
Where of thee oh Death, [will be] the sting?

7 Που σου, ᾅδη, το νικος;
Where of thee oh Hell, the victory?

8 Το δε κεντρον του θανατου, ἡ
the But sting of the death, [is] the

9 ἁμαρτια·
sin;

MISSIONARY WORK.

LONDON.

The eloquent Dr Bellows of New York, during his short stay, has not only addressed the public from the Unitarian pulpits,—but at the prison congress, he delivered an able lecture on Howard before Cardinal Manning and those of various sects or parties. We are glad to hear it will be published, as the liberal spirit in which it is treated cannot fail to soften some of the hard sectarian lines in which too many mould their philanthropy. The Unitarians of London took the opportunity of his being in town to invite him; and, perhaps, one of the most interesting meetings of the season was that held on the 11th instant, in the elegant Upper Room of the Freemasons' Tavern, where breakfast tables were spread for 150 guests, and ornamented with flowers. Here Dr Bellows gave an interesting address, urging the importance of maintaining instituted Christianity. He said "our altar has on it nothing but blessings, but we will keep it burning with our most precious spices. Is it not worth while to make sacrifices for a cause which has nothing but the good of the whole human race, and nothing but the broadest sympathy with the whole of humanity, for its end and object?" Baron Von Holtzendorf, the eminent German prison law reformer, in returning thanks for his kind reception and the sympathy shown to the German Protestant union with which he is connected, touched on the movements in favor of religious reform in his own country tending to sunder the unfortunate connection between Church and State. He knew that everywhere in Germany, where there is not merely hereditary religion but a thinking religion and a free conscience, Unitarian doctrines are strongly prevailing; and believed that the international religions of mankind would be forms of Unitarianism. Miss Carpenter enjoined attention to India, and the heavy responsibility we have of raising the people of that empire, and the hopelessness of any attempt to bring any large number to Christianity except by Unitarian views! Lady Bowring spoke of the need to disseminate Unitarianism, both by precept and example. Mrs Howe of America advocated the peaceful aspects of Christianity, and that it is the duty of women to see that in the future they shall sway the counsels of society. Mr Kovacs, a Hungarian, spoke in excellent English. Chief-Justice Smale of China, and the Rev. Chas. Lowe of America gave stirring addresses. Mr Lowe pressed home the duty of more organized denominational activity. He thought the principles of liberty valuable enough to make it worth while for every true lover of them to sacrifice a little of his own complete independence in order that, by combining with others, he may work more effectually to accomplish such an end. He believed in the real worth and importance of the position it is permitted to us to hold. He hoped to see a glorious result from the new denominational buildings suggested to be erected in the centre of London. A cordial vote of thanks to James Hopgood, Esq, for presiding concluded this notable gathering of Unitarian philanthropists.

OPEN AIR MISSION WORK.

To the Editor of the Unitarian Missionary.

Sir,—If you think it suitable, in some future number, I will give my experience as to an experiment in advocating Unitarianism before a mixed assembly. My object is to get that large class, *the passers by*, to listen, to buy Unitarian Publications, and finally induce some to attend our places for Unitarian worship. Having resolved to try to bear such burdens as could not be overcome, to suffer apparent failure, but still to persevere, I now state, for the encouragement of others, that the task has been found easier than expected. Three things are clearly established,—1. The name Unitarian must not be shunned. 2. The Unitarian Doctrine is attentively listened to; and 3. Unitarian Literature is readily sold. I have obtained regular subscribers for *The Unitarian Herald*, *The Christian Freeman*, and the last two Sundays I tried the *Unitarian Missionary*. The first Sunday nine numbers were sold; the second six, could have sold nine, but the supply was limited. Mr Samuel Sharpe kindly gave me some tracts to distribute. The rush for them made me put on a price, ½d. each, so that the most anxious persons may get them,—sold all out,—pockets not large enough. The next move will be a good size bag, then a volunteer to help, to sell (in London), and others to give us tracts; which will, I trust, bring its due reward.—I am, &c.

Perseverance.

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

No. 9. SEPTEMBER 1872. PRICE 1D.

ORTHODOX DOCTRINES DENIED BY UNITARIANS.

By the Rev. JOHN WRIGHT, B.A., Bury.

No. 5.—ORIGINAL SIN.

ONE of the great duties of the teachers of religion is to warn men against sin, and to persuade them to resist temptation. Yet at the same time some systems of religion teach that sin is *natural* to man. The 9th article of the Church of England asserts—

> Original Sin is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit, and therefore, in every person born into the world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation.

The Church Catechism says we are "by nature born in sin and the children of wrath;" and the Church service for the baptism of infants speaks of "all men" as "born in sin," and of the child as by nature incapable of virtue and piety, and needing to be released of his sins.

It is thus taught that man is born in a state of sin,—is sinful without any acts of his own, so that even the little babe is corrupt—inherits from Adam a pollution, from which he cannot free himself by any effort he can make—is therefore liable to punishment whether or not he has intentionally and wilfully done wrong—and even if he dies in infancy deserves God's wrath and damnation, unless he has been redeemed by baptism. It is asserted that not the individual, but the *nature* is sinful and is punished.

Does this doctrine agree with what all Christians believe to be the character of God? We speak of Him as just and loving. Think of the millions upon millions of human beings who came into existence before the time of Christ, and the millions more since his time who have never heard of him. Is it JUST that all these should be cursed with a corrupt nature, and in consequence be condemned by God, on account of what Adam did? Is it JUST that the most severe penalties should be inflicted on you and me at the present day, on account of a sin committed thousands of years ago? God forbids us to sin, threatens an awful punishment against sinners, makes sin the source of unspeakable misery. Is this JUST, if He has so formed us that we are by nature sinful? What must we think of a Deity who makes men corrupt, and then sends them to Hell for being what He has made them? Again, God is Love, hateth nothing that He has made, is a tender Father to all mankind. Is it LOVE that brings into being generation after generation of men and women so naturally

Digitized by Google

corrupt that they can do nothing but make themselves and each other miserable? Is it the act of a FATHER to visit on *all* his children the consequences of one act of disobedience, and that an act with which they had nothing to do? If the necessary consequence of Adam's transgression was the depravity of all his descendants, the kindest thing would have been to prevent him from having any descendants, since the great majority of them come into existence (as orthodoxy teaches) only for everlasting suffering. To make sin the cause of suffering, and yet to make man by nature necessarily sinful, to command us to do right and yet to form us incapable of doing right, to create multitudes of beings for unavoidable misery, is what we might expect from an omnipotent Devil, but is totally opposed to all our notions of the attributes of the Christian's God.

In all our concerns, individual, domestic, and social, we treat sin as a thing that deserves punishment. When you have committed a sin you blush to have it known, you blame yourself for it, and feel remorse. Why should you do this, if you have simply acted in accordance with the nature God gave you? *You* are not in fault for being sinful if you are created corrupt. Every good parent warns his child against evil, rebukes and punishes him when he has done wrong. Yet if the doctrine of original sin be true, the wrong is not the child's fault, but the consequences of his nature, and in trying to check the wrong you are striving against God. You might as well try to teach your child to see when he is born blind, as to try to make him virtuous if he is born naturally corrupt. Society inflicts penalties on criminals, looks with indignation and scorn on those who are habitually vicious, hopes by education and reformatory institutions to lessen the number of such. All this social action shows that men are practically convinced that they are capable of doing right, that they regard sin not as a universal disease, but as a personal transgression for which he who commits it is accountable, and that the doctrine of original sin cannot be consistently acted upon in any of the concerns of life.

Tell the mother, as she tenderly cradles her baby in her arms, that it is a mass of corruption and impurity, and doomed (if it die unbaptised) to eternal torment. Can her heart sanction the doctrine? If she believes it, can she any longer thank God for giving her that child? When you join with friends around the social board, or meet associates with the grasp of friendship, or mix with your fellow-creatures in the street or the shop or the factory, think that they are all naturally sinful, that they are all inclined to evil, that they are all under the curse of God, and the world will be a Hell to you, when thus it seems peopled with Devils. But men *cannot* carry out the doctrine in real life. Their own feelings and instincts are too strong for it. If they believed it, and realised it, and acted on it, the happiness of life would be so completely lost, the light of virtue would be so eternally clouded over, that wickedness would reign supreme, and every heart would be filled with hatred for others and despair for itself.

To whatever extent, however, original sin is believed in, it must have a bad practical effect. Many a conscience is comforted, when it feels sad with the sense of guilt, by the thought that sin is natural to us. Many an effort to do right is checked, many a virtuous enterprise is discouraged, by the belief that it is all in vain to struggle against nature. The most fearful assistance is afforded to all the temptations men have to battle against, by the theological dogma that they cannot help themselves, that they are stamped with evil as the effect of Adam's fall. Until this dogma is destroyed, all efforts to reform mankind must labour under a disadvantage.

For these reasons Unitarians reject the doctrine of "original sin;" (1) because it is inconsistent with the justice and the love of God; (2) because it is opposed to the consciousness man has that *he* is to be blamed when he has done wrong; (3) because it is contradicted by our treatment of the sinful in the family, in society, and in the state; (4) because it is protested against by all our feelings towards our fellow-creatures; (5) because it has a bad practical effect.

The believers in the doctrine answer by two arguments. First, they point to the sin existing in the world, and say there could not be so much, unless men were naturally corrupt. We reply, there is more virtue than sin among mankind,

Digitized by Google

more good than evil. You meet with no human being without some good in him. The most degraded and abandoned has yet a kind feeling towards some fellow-creature, a tender association with some virtuous remembrance, a disposition towards good in some direction or other. All of us must have met with or heard of striking proofs of this. All the descriptions of the wickedness of mankind may be out-weighed by descriptions of their excellences. Every home furnishes instances of kind feeling and cheerful self-sacrifice; every day sees millions toiling with industry, dealing with integrity, governing appetite and conquering passion, thinking more of others than of themselves. Then look at the heroes of the world, remember the lives of the patriots who have bled for their country, of the philanthropists who have toiled on, through good report and bad report, for their fellow-beings, of the martyrs who have died for truth, of the saints of every different religion, who have denied their selfish desires, for the love of God. But it is not necessary to prove that there is more good than evil in men as a whole. If it be granted that *some* men are splendid examples of all that is great and noble, this is enough to free human nature from the charge of inherent corruption. There have been many instances of true consistent life-long virtue, among Jews and heathens, and persons who never heard of "Christianity," this proves that man is not by nature inherently and entirely depraved. No one can deny that there have been and are many such instances, and hence the appeal to experience totally fails to establish the doctrine of original sin.

The other argument advanced in support of this doctrine is an appeal to Scripture. The account of "the fall" in *Gen. iii.* is referred to, but this does not say one word as to the effects of Adam's sin on his descendants. Other texts from the Old Testament speak in strong terms of man's sinfulness, but not one says *all* men are *born* sinful. There is not a word attributed to Christ, not a single sentence in the gospels, that even seems to support the doctrine. The principal support for it is found in the epistles of Paul. He frequently speaks of men as sinners, but he at the same time blames them for it, showing that sin is not natural to them. He declares that in his flesh there is no good thing, but he thus speaks only of part of his nature, the lower and animal part. The passage most insisted on is *Rom. v.* A careful perusal of this chapter will show that the writer refers in it to the Hebrew belief that men are mortal because of Adam's sin, and that he says nothing as to the moral nature of man. This one obscure passage is a small foundation on which to build up such an awful doctrine. On the other hand, we have assurance in Scripture, that God has made man in his own image, (*Gen. i.* 27; *James iii.* 9); Christ said that to enter into his kingdom, we must become as little children; he commanded his disciples to be perfect even as God is perfect. (*Matt. xviii.* 3, *v.* 48.) All the prophets and apostles exhorted men to virtue, as though they believed them capable of it. The balance of Scripture evidence is certainly not in favour of original sin.

Unitarians are satisfied, therefore, that the teachings of reason and conscience, the feelings of the heart and the institutions of society, the belief in the love and justice of God, are not contradicted by the spirit of the Bible, and that man is made capable of good as well as of evil. It depends on each man to choose for himself between right and wrong. To whatever extent he is sinful, it is his own fault. Whatever virtue he aspires to, he may gain if he will only exert himself. "*God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions.*" *Ecc. vii.* 29. The infant comes into the world pure and spotless; the little child to-day is the same innocent being as he was when Christ took him in his arms and blessed him; the man may keep himself pure from evil and make himself strong in virtue, if only he will exert the will that God gives him. Sin is essentially unnatural to us. All the evil in the world is the result, not of the decree of God, but of the weakness and wilfulness of man. Our Creator has left us to choice between right and wrong, that we may thus be educated to manly self-dependence, and by conquering temptation may gain the high position of true sons of God. He will never impute to any one any sins but his own, or punish any one for the fault of a distant ancestor. The sin of Adam has no influence on the moral state of men now. There is nothing in our nature or constitution which can furnish to an individual an excuse for his

Digitized by Google

personal sin. There is nothing but his own personal sin that can bring on any one the pain which is the consequence of sin. "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." *Gal. vi.* 7.

ON THE PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES.

THE origin of these two great religious parties among the Jews is an obscure subject; but we receive a few hints from history which may help our conjectures. The earliest notice of any division of the Jews in opinion relates to state politics, not to religion or philosophy. When King Ahaz was unwise enough to call in the Assyrians to help him against the Northern Israelites, when his own subjects suffered severely from these so-called allies, the prophet Joel remonstrated on behalf of the suffering villagers. In the next reign, that of Hezekiah, the bribes, which were before paid to bring the Assyrians into the country, were now paid to induce them to withdraw. The villagers must have been well pleased to obtain the withdrawal of the invaders on any terms; but those who were safe within the city walls counselled resistance. Hezekiah in changing his policy, changed his advisers. Shebna was dismissed, and Eliakim for a short time set in his place. This change was made with the full approval of the prophet Isaiah (Isaiah xxii.) The prophet Micah also, like Isaiah, seems to have counselled resistance. The villagers, however, must have been for peace at any price. In the next reign, that of Manasseh, the country party prevailed, peace with the enemy was bought, and the victory of the country party over the city party was further shown by their being allowed to sacrifice on their altars or High Places, instead of being required, as they were for a time by Hezekiah, to send up their offerings to the priests at Jerusalem. And here we learn that this division of the state into parties, if not a religious division, was at least as much ecclesiastical as political. It was a struggle for power between the Levites of the provinces and the Priests of the capital. The priests were named Sons of Aaron, and also Sons of Zadok (Ezek. xl. 46.) And we may, by conjecture, give names to these two parties. While the one party was that of the Zadokites or Sadducees, the other might very naturally be called Pharisees or *villagers*. In the following unhappy reigns the struggle between the two parties becomes yet more violent; and kings were put on the throne and put to death alternately, either by the city party who would resist the Babylonian invaders, or by the country party who would submit for peace sake. The prophet Jeremiah strongly counselled peace and submission, and very nearly lost his life for doing so.

On the return from the Captivity in Babylon, the state of affairs was wholly changed. As the people were now governed by foreign tyrants, whose aim was to keep them quiet, and to levy as large a tribute as possible, the city party was no longer able to forbid the sacrifices on the High Places throughout the country, although in their writings they support the claims of Jerusalem. And here we loose sight of the two political parties. On the overthrow of Persia, Greek influence and civilization gains some admission into Jerusalem, and this may have made a philosophical, if not a religious, separation between the priesthood in the city and the Levites throughout the country. Such new and foreign opinions show themselves in the Book of Ecclesiastes. But as Greek civilization was only brought in by Greek tyranny, patriotism henceforth takes the form of bigotry, and more enlightened views are spoiled by scepticism. And now we approach the times of the New Testament writers, from whom we learn something of the two religious parties in Jerusalem. The Sadducees, the more enlightened, but more sceptical, are in the minority; and the Pharisees, more bigoted and more popular, are followed by the mojority. If we would compare them to the men of our own time, we should call the Pharisees the parochial clergy, the country clergy in particular, earnestly opposed to all change; the Sadducees, we may compare to the Broad Church, to the Erastian clergy, more liberal but less sincere, with far fewer

Digitized by Google

followers. By thus showing the very probable connection between the more modern religious parties and the earlier political parties, we are able to explain how the one got named the Sadducees, Zadokites, Sons of Zadok, or Priests, and the other the Pharisees or *villagers*, who were usually opposed to the priests of Jerusalem. S. S.

ON THE PURPOSE OF THE BOOK OF JOB.

IN a former Number we gave our reasons for considering the Book of Job as written after the return from captivity, perhaps about the time of Ezra, or B.C. 470; and we shall find that the arguments of the speakers belong very particularly to that time. The Jews had always been taught by their religious guides that all sufferings are sent to man as a punishment for his sins, or for his father's sins. This, of course, it would be difficult to disprove; a man, when in misfortune, might not be aware of having himself committed any sin deserving the punishment, but he could not pretend to know that his ancestors never had; and the Commandment had told him that God visits the sins of the father upon the children even to the third and fourth generation. In this opinion the Jews had rested contentedly for centuries. When their northern neighbours, the ten tribes of Israel, were conquered and carried into captivity, the Jews said it was the natural punishment for their sin in revolting against Solomon's son, Rehoboam. But presently the same heavy misfortune fell upon themselves—their nation was destroyed; and then, as it would seem, for the first time some of them seriously doubted of the truth of what they had been taught, and asked themselves, Have we deserved this heavy punishment? Others, indeed, less religiously disposed, scoffed at the Commandment altogether, and made use of the proverb, "The father's ate sour grapes, and the children's teeth were set on edge." The writer of Isaiah lv. had met the difficulty shortly, and as with authority, making the Almighty say, "My thoughts are not as your thoughts, nor my ways as your ways." But the writer of Job treats the matter more argumentatively. Job's friends assert, according to the received opinion, that, as Job is in misfortune, it must be because he has sinned. They appeal to experience, and remark that they have never known a wicked man to prosper. The unhappy Job, however, like the nation, cannot admit that his sins and his sufferings are to be taken the one as the measure of the other. And the writer, to get out of the difficulty, brings in the Almighty as a speaker, who, without explaining how far Job's friends may be right in their view of the Divine dealings with man, or how far Job may be right in his assertion of his innocence, points out the very limited extent of man's knowledge; and he thus leaves us to conclude that we must not hope to be able to understand why the Almighty sends physical evil into the world. The question of moral evil is not touched upon.

The aim of the writer is to deny the old opinion, that all misfortunes are a punishment for sin, and to do so without charging want of wisdom upon God. But at the end he shows that he is not quite satisfied with his own treatment of the subject; and he describes Job as being restored to his former prosperity, as it would seem, as a reward for his goodness.

SAMUEL SHARPE.

Objects close to the eye shut out much larger objects on the horizon; and splendors born only of the earth eclipse the stars. So a man sometimes covers up the entire disc of eternity with a dollar, and quenches transcendent glories with a little shining dust.—*Chapin.*

Glorify a lie, legalize a lie, arm and equip a lie, consecrate a lie with solemn forms and awful penalties, and after all, it is nothing but a lie. It rots a land and corrupts a people, like any other lie, and by-and-bye the white light of God's truth shines clear through it, and shows it to be a lie.—*Chapin.*

That orthodoxy has commonly been error is plain from this, that orthodoxy is another name for the opinion of the majority; and in religious disputes the majority has, for the most part, been wrong. And this is only saying in other words that truth has commonly been known and believed by few. Besides, orthodoxy does not always mean what the majority really believe, but only what the majority find it convenient to profess.—*Dr Lee.*

Digitized by Google

THE FOLLY OF CREEDS.

IN these days of Creeds, and Confessions, and Articles of Belief, by which Churches, Councils, and General Assemblies seek to produce and enforce uniformity of opinion in all matters of theology among all men, a result it is not possible to produce, neither is it desirable although it were possible. You cannot get two people exactly alike, neither can you get two blades of grass alike—you cannot make two clocks beat together exactly alike, neither can any ecclesiastically-framed Creed make any two people think alike. Truth will fall on the human mind like the rays of light on an object at an angle peculiar to each mind and each object, and be reflected, absorbed, or transmitted according to the respective qualities of each, and individual uniformity of thought or belief is absolutely out of the question. Allow me to point out an example of higher authority than any of the modern creed-makers and its result, and then judge for yourselves whether the more ancient is not the wiser method. The great Jewish lawgiver gave as his first commandment "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," by which worship was directed to be paid to God alone; and by the second they were expressly forbidden to make any image of this God; they were forbidden to worship any one object in nature, or even to make an image of any one object in nature, for the purpose of divine worship. Thus they were rather taught to conceive of God, to think of God, to view God by the eye of the mind than by any bodily sense; that while God was in nature in the most complete sense, yet as they were positively prohibited from worshiping him through any natural object, he was still inconceivably above and beyond nature. The result of this was, that though their first conceptions of God were crude indeed, they corrected themselves from age to age. Compare the first idea of God to be found in the first few chapters of Genesis, where you will find Him represented as frequently visiting and talking to His first children, reproving them by plain speech; He is also represented as being endowed with human passions, as repenting and being grieved to the heart, and as being disappointed with the creation of man on the earth. In the Patriarchal age, his visits are few and select, but still conversations of his are given with Noah, with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob; and with Moses he is said to have spoken face to face as a man speaks to his friend. But with the establishment of the priesthood, and a cumbrous system of sacrifices and ceremonial observances, he only could be communicated with through these, and there is nothing to show that he was seen at all. Then, in the Prophetical age, he communicates with the prophets by means of visions and dreams, and we discern signs of a higher idea beginning to be entertained. We find them looking beyond the sacrifices, and declaring personal morality to be the thing required—see Psalms l. 9-23, also li. 16, 17, "For Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: Thou delightest not in burnt-offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Isaiah lxvi. 1, 2, Micah vi. 6, 7, 8. Then when we come to the times of Christ, we find that great founder of Christianity proclaiming, "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

Enough has been quoted to show the progressive nature of the human idea of God entertained by the Jews. Their thoughts about God were not cramped by any stereotyped creed, nor their worship disfigured by any material image of their own construction. So their conception of God grew with the growth of knowledge, and expanded with the exercise of their reason and intellect, in fact grew broader, and deeper, and higher as the ages rolled onward. These facts then sufficiently warrant the assumption that the Jewish literature and the Jewish thought about God on which the orthodox systems of theology are founded, had it not been interrupted by national calamity, and finally closed altogether by national extinction, would have grown into the most advanced thought, and equalled the high-

Digitized by Google

est, the holiest, and the most sublime conceptions of the Deity in this our own age. But to secure this uniformity of belief, which appears to be still such a desideratum with the priests and clergy, creeds were invented, and so a stop was at once put to all progress in theology, and bounds at once definitely set to all human enquiry. The church called in the aid of the civil magistrate, who came with pains and penalties, fire and faggot, to burn, slay, and destroy all who would or could not pronounce the Church's Shibboleth. Shame upon them! As well might all the Œcumenical Councils, Pastoral Convocations, and General Assemblies have tried to collect all the rays of the sun into the focus of one lens, as to put down all God's truth into the compass of thirty-nine articles or a single creed. Creeds, like clothes, can only be made for one age, and often for only one individual. The clothes of the child will be too small for the boy, and the boy's clothes will not fit the man; so the beliefs and notions of the childhood of the human race must be corrected from time to time as the race grows in years. Again the spirit of free enquiry has burst the bonds of every creed in Christendom. Great minds have arisen among us who, in spite of the church's anathemas, have,—borne on the great tidal wave of human progress,—sailed boldly on the ocean of truth, and enriched the storehouses of human knowledge with fresh discoveries, fresh revelations of the infinite mind, and the dust and cobwebs of centuries are being swept away. Where would have been the discoveries of Columbus had he followed the advice of the wiseacres of his day and kept within sight of land? And where would our knowledge be in this ninteenth century if we had clung to the ancient landmarks, the creeds and confessions of our forefathers? Away then with your creeds, your confessions, your thirty-nine articles, they stifle the growth of the divinity within us as the ivy sucks the life-blood of the tree around which it clings! If you wish to join in the great march of human progress you must strike the fetters of creed from your limbs, and "the truth shall make you free!"

D. S. HODGE, DUNDEE.

ONE WAY TO HELP IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

THERE are many people who would gladly help in Sunday School work, but who unluckily cannot get to the School just at those particular hours at which school is held. To these people I should like to tell of a plan in which they may give valuable help. Write notes to the children in a friend's class. I drifted into this myself, found it out half by accident, and it seems to me so good in its results that if it were generally known many people would wish to do the same. I should like to see each class of suitable age provided, not only as now with a teacher, but also with a correspondent. The children need not be very old, for one of my little ones is only five years old, and he wrote out the alphabet to make up his letter, wrote it as he was "laying a bed" ill. The eldest, I believe, is 14.

To begin at the beginning—I sent a few little reward books to the teacher, asking her to give them to her children, which she did, and set them to write to thank me for them. I acknowledged the receipt of the notes, and they wrote again; so our correspondence grew into a settled thing. Once or twice, not having very much to say to these children whom I had never seen, I put a drawing on the head of my paper to fill up space, one of the children copied hers; so, finding I was teaching drawing, I sent others, and charged the children to copy them, which they did. This letter writing and the drawing, which was quite a novelty in the village, became so popular that little neighbours asked leave to write, and a little brother sent to know "if I allowed little boys to write to me." Several of the parents sent messages of thanks. One father had his eyes so much opened to the value of education that he bought for his little daughter "a whole quire of paper," in order that she should not be hindered for want of materials. Most of the children have bought themselves paint boxes to paint their drawings with.

The number increased so much that in six months I had 45 little correspondents. Out of that number I receive from 8 to 16

Digitized by Google

letters each week, and I send my answers back on Saturday that the teacher may receive and distribute them on Sunday, then she collects their notes and sends them off to me. The children come to meet her on her way to school, and one Sunday when they thought she would not be able to come, they went all the way to her home (a mile from school) to get their letters, saying "Oh! we don't care for our dinners if we can get our letters!"

Perhaps some one will say this is a rose-coloured story. It is! for it is the nature of children not only to see certain things all rose coloured, but to make those who have dealings with them see through their eyes.

What do I say to them? I send them as much good advice and instruction as I think they will swallow. I ask them questions so that they may have something to say to me. I answer what they say, and show them that I am pleased when they do anything well.

Anyone troubled with a dearth of ideas could not do better than to take some interesting child's book and copy it out, a page or so at a time, heading each with "My Dear Louisa" or "My Dear John," as the case might be, and ending with "Yours truly," and his or her own signature. A little invention might add a few questions that the children should answer to show that they have understood, and a few comments on their last letter. But most people will find plenty to say.

Every one values letters, even those who receive many, and have many other pleasures. Poor children who are not made fastidious by an overplus do not think the less of them.

LOVE AND TRUTH.

BY J. G. WHITTIER.

Oh, Love Divine!—whose constant beam
  Shines on the eyes that will not see,
  And waits to bless us, while we dream
Thou leavest us because we turn from thee!

All souls that struggle and aspire,
  All hearts of prayer by thee are lit;
  And, dim or clear, thy tongues of fire
On dusky tribes and twilight centuries sit.

Nor bounds, nor clime, nor creed thou know'st,
  Wide as our need thy favours fall;
  The white wings of the Holy Ghost
Stoop, seen or unseen, o'er the heads of all.

Oh, Beauty, old yet ever new!*
  Eternal Voice, and Inward Word,
  The Logos of the Greek and Jew,
The old sphere-music which the Samian heard!

Truth which the sage and prophet saw,
  Long sought without but found within,
  The Law of Love beyond all law,
The Life o'erflooding mortal death and sin!

Shine on us with the light which glowed
  Upon the trance-bound shepherd's way,
  Who saw the Darkness overflowed
And drowned by tides by everlasting Day.†

Shine, light of God!—make broad thy scope
  To all who sin and suffer; more
  And better than we dare to hope,
With Heaven's compassion make our longings poor!

* "Too late I loved Thee, oh Beauty of ancient days, yet ever new! And lo! Thou wert within and I abroad searching for Thee. Thou wert with me, but I was not with thee."—AUGUST. SOLILOQ., BOOK X.

† "And I saw that there was an Ocean of Darkness and Death: but an Infinite Ocean of Light and Love flowed over the Ocean of Darkness: And in that I saw the Infinite Love of God."—GEORGE FOX'S JOURNAL.

GOD-MAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE UNITARIAN MISSIONARY.

Preaching lately on the words "The Everlasting Gospel," the Rev. George Gilfillan, as reported in the *Dundee Advertiser*, gave utterance to what may be justly regarded as a very singular expression of an odd sort of mental obliquity. "Of God himself," says the critic, "the infinite and absolute One, I have no proper *conception*—I am lost in His immensity, I am bewildered in the labyrinths of His attributes, I am drowned as in the depths of mere deity, but I find Him *conceivable* and loveable as manifested in the *God-Man*, Jesus Christ." Let it be observed that Mr Gilfillan admits that he can have no proper *conception* of an absolute and infinite God, at the same time he believes that this God as God and man in two distinct natures and one person for ever is *conceivable* and *loveable*. If I should tell Mr Gilfillan that a farthing rush-light has the same proportions and intensity of light as the sun, and that the sun has but the tiny flame and dim illuminating power of the rush-light; and, farther, that the rush-light is the sun and the sun is the rush-light in two distinct natures and one body for ever,—would he not think that I had offered a gross insult to his understanding? And yet this same understanding proposes to conceive how an absolute and infinite God can be a man at the same time. A God sitting at his own right hand pleading the cause of the sinner to Himself!!! In sober earnest, is it not easier to conceive of *one* being than *two* being *one*? A God-Man and a sun-rush-light may do in a pulpit, but cannot pass muster in a logical brain. W. ROBERTSON.

Broughty Ferry.

Sin is not only a sin, but it is an error. It is a mistake to be a sinner; it is a great mistake to forget God—to turn away from Christ.—*Chapin.*

Digitized by Google

THE CASE OF THE REV. W. KNIGHT OF DUNDEE.

WE had supposed that this case, which, to Unitarians, contains many interesting features, would have advanced a stage by this time. But we understand that the annual holidays of the Presbyters have prevented a meeting of the Presbytery being held.

The present state of affairs appears to be, that the Committee appointed by the Presbytery to help Mr Knight to repudiate the Unitarian body as any part of the Christian church have not met him,—they refusing to agree to the terms he laid down as mentioned in our last. *The Dundee Advertiser* has stated that Mr Knight has written to the Convener of the Committee, offering to "*give up*" one of the conditions, viz., that a reporter should be present during his interview with the Committee. This "give up" appears to us full of meaning. The recognition of the Committee implied in writing directly to the Convener, and not indirectly through the Dundee, Edinburgh, and Glasgow newspapers, is also a sign of a less marked antagonism towards his brethren. The *Advertiser* has also informed its readers that Mr Knight recently preached two powerful discourses, in Newport, on the Divinity of Christ. It may be, the aim in this is to convince people that Mr Knight believes the doctrine of the Deity of Jesus. If he is a consistent orthodox minister, one does not see why it needs advertising that he has preached on a doctrine he believes. It is often when men are not quite satisfied themselves with their position that they take the greatest pains to impress others with their soundness. We have read Mr Knight's sermon, preached in Mr Martineau's chapel, and we do not find in it any evidence to give us reason to think the author believed Jesus to be God; but Jesus seems to be placed among the prophets, yet far above them all, who spoke as "having the authority of experience, the authority of a revealer," in which there is nothing but what many Unitarians would allow.

A new feature appears in the case since the publishing in the *Contemporary Review* of a paper by Mr Knight on "The Ethics of Creed Subscription." In plain English this is,—the honesty of putting one's name to a Confession of Faith; and we are told that a man may sign such a document though he does not consider it as altogether what his name would lead an outsider to think he held it to be.

We understand Mr Knight's paper to be a plea for dishonesty. We will allow the statement which he may make, that his conscience does not feel the injury that we think is done to it. We, however, believe, that for a man to tell the world, when he comes before his fellow-men as the expounder of the pure morality of Christ, that their *yea* need not be their *yea*, nor their *nay* their *nay*, is to play fast and loose with God's eternal truth. The criminal might as well say that he felt no injury in his conscience from his immoral behaviour; but society refuses to allow him to judge. And we have not been surprised to find that many men have strongly condemned the immorality of putting one's name to creeds one does not wholly believe. Since the appearance of this article, the prospect has been changed. However much we desire to find men coming to the understanding and enjoyment of the Unitarian position, we feel there is one condition absolutely necessary, and that is, out-and-out frankness and straightforwardness. We pity the Nicodemuses of this age. We like to know our friends and to know our foes. Give us an honest Calvinist before a dishonest Unitarian. Whatever may be the final settlement of this case, one thing is certain—there is a better opinion held of those whose only offence is to be Unitarians; and many have been led to look into Unitarian works, who, without some inducement, would perhaps not have done so. We desire to give inquirers every facility for coming to a knowledge of our position, and when they take it as their own we shall rejoice, though, at the same time, they must be told it involves sacrifice, and sometimes loss; but, for our encouragement, we believe the prospect was never brighter for the cause of simple Christianity than now.

Digitized by Google

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

NINTH LESSON.

THE PREPOSITIONS.

GREEK VERBS so often have a Preposition, sometimes even two Prepositions, added at the beginning so as to form the first few letters of the word, that we cannot know the Verbs properly, till we know the Prepositions.

The Prepositions are not declined; and seem easy to us beginners with the English made to our hands; but their meanings are so many and varying according to circumstances, that Scholars find need to write largely upon their meanings. However, leaving these for the present, we give them with only one, the most English to each.

THE PREPOSITIONS.

αντι .	instead of.	Governs the Genitive.
απο .	from.	
εκ or εξ .	out of.	
προ .	before.	
εν .	in.	Dative.
συν .	with.	
εις .	into.	Accusative.
ανα .	up.	
δια with Gen.	through. by means of.	Genitive or Accusative
δια with Acc.	for the sake of.	
κατα .	down.	
μετα .	after.	
ὑπερ .	over.	
αμφι .	about.	Genitive, Dative, or Accusative
περι .	concerning.	
επι .	upon.	
προς .	towards.	
παρα .	by the side of.	
ὑπο .	under.	

When a Preposition stands before a Noun, *it governs the Noun;* requiring it to be in some particular case, as on line 1, εκ, *in*, has put μερους, *part*, into the Genitive (a contracted gen.); line 8, δια, *by means of*, has made εσοπτρου, *a mirror*, also Genitive, and εν, *in*, αινιγματι, *a riddle*, Dative; and on line 9, προς, *to*, has made προσωπον, *face*, Accusative.

When a Preposition is joined to a Verb it only sometimes keeps this power; but it either adds to the meaning, as

line 2, προ - φητευ - ομεν,
fore - tell - we,

or only strengthens the meaning, as compare lines 10 and 1,

γινωσκ - ω, επι - γνω - σομαι.
know - I, thoroughly - know - I shall.

When a Verb is compounded with a Preposition, it takes the Augment or the Reduplication, after the Preposition, and before the Verb, in fact in the middle of the word. And those Prepositions that end with a vowel, drop their last letter in the tenses that have an Augment or Reduplication, as if to make way for it, thus,

Future Middle.	1st Aorist Passive.
επι - γνωσομαι,	επ - ε - γνωσθην.
I shall know thoroughly,	I am known thoroughly.

Therefore, in order to look out επεγνωσθην, besides altering the tense-ending θην into κω, we must drop the ε of the Augment, and put on the final ι to επι, and then looking out, we shall find επιγινωσκω (for there is an ι in the Present, that our Aorist tense has lost by contraction, as the dictionary shows). Again, if the Verb itself begins with a Vowel, the Preposition drops its final Vowel in every tense, thus,

Future Passive.
lines 3-4 & 7, κατ - αργηθησεται,
will be put away,

Perfect, Indic., Active.
κατ - ηργηκα.
I have put away.

Now, in order to look out κατηργηκα, we find in the grammar that since it ends in κα, it must be Perfect Indicative, and will therefore have a Reduplication; and as we see besides that our word begins with the three first letters of κατα, thus, κατ, we

Digitized by Google

suspect that the fourth letter η must have been changed from α to make the Reduplication. Therefore, first we alter the tense-ending ηκα into εω, and then change the fourth letter η into α, and look out καταργεω.

The dictionary will show us that this α belongs to the verb, and that κατα has laid aside its final α in every tense, but this happens here to make no difference to us in looking out the word.

1 Corinthians xiii. 9-12.

1 Εκ μερους γαρ γινωσκομεν, και εκ
in part For we know, and in

2 μερους προφητευομεν· Οταν δε ελθη
part we prophesy; when but may have come

3 το τελειον, τοτε το εκ μερους κατ-
the perfect, then the in part will-

4 αργηθησεται. Οτε ημην νηπιος, ως
be put away. When I was a child, as

5 νηπιος ελαλουν, ως νηπιος εφρονουν,
a child I spake, as a child I understood,

6 ως νηπιος ελογιζομην· οτε δε γεγονα
as a child I reasoned; since but I have become

7 ανηρ, κατηργηκα τα του νηπιου.
a man, I have put away the [things] of the child,

8 Βλεπομεν γαρ αρτι δι' εσοπτρου
we see For now by means of a mirror

9 εν αινιγματι, τοτε δε προσωπον προς
in a riddle, then but face to

10 προσωπον· αρτι γινωσκω εκ μερους,
face. Now I know in part,

11 τοτε δε επιγνωσομαι καθως και
then but I shall know thoroughly as also

12 επεγνωσθην.
I am thoroughly known.

NOTES OF PROGRESS.

We are glad to learn, from the Annual Report of the West Riding (Yorkshire) Unitarian Mission Society for 1871-72, that good work has been done during the past year, and that a fair prospect is held out for the future. A glance at the list of subscribers tells us that it is for want of opportunity, and not from want of will to do the work that needs to be done, that more has not been accomplished. Unitarians know they have good things to give to their fellow-men when they are ready to receive them. We are waiting for our work to begin, we have Missionary Societies and periodicals, but the call for our labor has not come, as we do not doubt it will be heard some day.

DUNFERMLINE.

The congregation which is under the care of the Rev. R. S. Bowie have, with their minister, expressed their willingness to associate with Unitarians. The Editor of the *Missionary* lectured in Dunfermline on the 18th ult., and was very kindly received; there was a fair attendance. If some help be given to the Dunfermline friends, we hope they will be able to do more than heretofore they have been in a position to attempt. One person was present who remembers the Unitarian lectures given in Dunfermline in the Rev. Geo. Harris's time, in which the Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, then of Edinburgh, and others, took part. It is gratifying to be able to think of another town in Scotland in which Liberal Christian worship and fellowship are maintained.

THE TRINITY UNSCRIPTURAL—A VANITY.

The following extract is taken from a letter addressed to us recently by an inquirer. We insert it as an interesting instance of the way in which people sometimes, quite unaided, arrive at the Unitarian position:—"I studied 'the Scriptures' for about three years, not to fortify myself with arguments on any creed whatever, but merely to ascertain what they really taught, although, no doubt, I had in view various ways of interpretation; and as I have allowed myself to settle down to digest what I had meditated on just as circumstances allowed or suggested, I must say that my mind has completely changed on what I was brought up; though Solomon says, 'bring up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it.' I find that 'the Trinity' is not God or the Divinity, but a mere priestly subtilty or imagination, like the doctrine of 'Baal' and 'Bel in Babylon.' Although modern Christians would be shocked at such an insinuation, and as I am inclined to believe that Unitarians repudiate this VANITY, I would like to see how they formulate their belief in 'the man Christ Jesus' in relation to Him. I believe in Christ, and that 'God was in him,' but to believe that he was 'very God,' or he who has 'no manner of similitute,' and who is 'invisible,' and also 'the *God* and *Father* of our *Lord* Jesus Christ,' is more than I can do without denying both as I believe."

Digitized by Google

SAYINGS OF THE REV. JAMES MARTINEAU.

MANY people, we know, have been seeking to get some acquaintance with the thoughts of Mr Martineau. We have selected a few sentences from some of his addresses, which we hope will interest our readers.

RELIGION AND THEOLOGY.

Religion ever expresses the trust and love of a reposing heart; but in our time theology has become the prolonged utterance of distrust, of querulousness, of anxious alarm.

THE SCRIPTURES.

Deeply as I reverence the Scriptures, they seem to me to have been placed by Protestant theologians in a position which they are not capable of bearing; they are called upon to pronounce conclusively upon questions respecting the construction of this Universe, the nature of man, and the whole present and future of our humanity; and this is a function they are not intended to assume.

THE DIVINE SPIRIT AND THE HUMAN SPIRIT.

Whatever may become of our inherited and historical beliefs, whatever havoc honest criticism may make in that which has been handed down to us, I have the deepest and firmest persuasion that the human spirit and the Divine spirit will for ever find each other out by ways which probably we are unable to apprehend at present,—as God is an infinite reality, and as man is gifted, notwithstanding the finite nature of his powers, with the means of apprehending this infinite reality. I believe that whatever be taken away from us, the human spirit and the Divine spirit will find each other out.

THE CHRISTIAN MISSION TO THE DEGRADED.

Of this Divine work we must never weary or despair, but carry into it the eternal patience of God, who, age after age, solicits with His grace every soul of man, and now here, now there, stands at the door and knocks, and would lift the latch on the first hospitable hint. With one and with another, nay, with multitudes, the Christian appeal may seem to be made utterly in vain; but, if only the true beat of the heart goes forth with it, it will find some hiding place in many a mind that for a moment seems to heed it not, and like the phrase of a forgotten strain of music, or the snatches of a dream, will steal forth in some tender twilight hour, when there are none to see the tears of penitence, or to mock at the returning tones of prayer. My friends, trust in the living spirit of God, which finds some crevice still open in the darkest heart by this persistency of appeal that cannot listen to despondency. . . . . There lies the true missionary gift—deep faith in God; deep pity for man; strength to carry the devotion of divine order into all the clash and confusion of this world; and wherever you meet with any good measure of this gift, thank God that the prophets are not dead.

THE LIVING UNION OF GOD WITH OUR HUMANITY.

The one deep faith, then, which has determined my whole word and work among you, is, in *The Living Union of God with our Humanity*. Long did this faith pine obscurely within me ere it could find its way to any clear joy. It was not enough for me that God should—as they say—"*exist*," it was needful to have assurance that He *lives*. It was a poor thought that He was the *beginning* of all if He stood aloof from it in its *constancy*. It withered the inmost heart to believe that He dwelt and never stirred in the universal space, and delegated all to inexorable "Laws,"—laws that could never hear the most piercing shriek, and looked with stony eyes on the upturned face of agony. It seemed to stain the very heaven to charge Him with the orign of human guilt, and represent Him as first moulding men into sin, and then punishing them out of it. A mere constructing and legislating God, satisfied to adjust "co-existences" and establish "successions;" who filled the cold sky, and brooded over the waste sea, and watched upon the mountain head, and embraced the waxing and waning moon, and suffered the tide of history to sweep through Him without heeding its most passionate and surging waves;—a God who wrung from us a thousand sighs that never touched him, who broke us in remorse for ills that are not ours,—who drew to him, day and night, without ceasing, moans of prayer he never answered;—such a one it was a vain attempt really to trust and love. At times the faith in him appeared but to turn the darkness of atheism into flame; and in its light the face of this blessed life and universe lost its fostering look, and seemed twisted into an Almighty sarcasm. Nor could I ever feel that the permanent stillness and personal inaccessibility of God was at all compensated by exceptional miracle. . . . . We pine as prisoners, till we burst into the air of that *supernatural life which He lives eternally;* we are parched with a holy thrist till we find contact with the running waters of his quick affection. Him *immediately*, Him *in person;* Him in whispers of the day, and eye to eye by night; Him for a close refuge in temptation,—not as a large thought of ours, but as an Almightyness in himself; Him ready with his moistening dews for the dry heart, and his breathings of hope for the sorrowing; Him always and everywhere living for our holy trust do we absolutely need for our repose, and wildly wander till we find.

CHRISTIANITY.

May we not say that when Christianity shall be re-born from its collapse, it will rise again with two commandments instead of ten—the love of God, and the love of man; with the beatitudes in the place of creeds, with a doctrine of self-sacrifice in the place of a vicarious atonement; with a belief in the incarnation of God in our humanity in place of a mere individual incarnation of God in Jesus Christ.

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

No. 10. OCTOBER 1872. PRICE 1D.

LIBERAL JUDAISM.

By the Rev. EPHRAIM TURLAND, Ainsworth.

IN an article which appeared in the last number of this Magazine on "The Folly of Creeds," it was remarked that, until the overthrow of the Jewish nationality, there had been going on a process of development in the nation's ideas of God and man's relation to Him. From humble and material beginnings the Hebrew religion had been enlarged and purified until it became, at least, comparatively, a noble faith. I desire to strengthen this argument by showing, in simple justice to modern liberal Judaism, that this process of development did not cease with the national catastrophe, but has been going on ever since, and is now especially active.

Three centuries before our era there were two theological divisions in the Jewish church—a broad and spiritual party, and a narrow literal and legal one. The traditions of the former of these parties have never been lost; and, in their advanced form, they are now a power in Judaism. The progress of the moral and religious ideas may be traced in the *Pirké Abhóth*, a moral treatise forming part of the Mishneh, or collection of oral traditions. Many of the precepts of the Pirké Abhóth inculcate legal and ceremonial morality; but others breathe a pure spirituality. Some sentences, attributed to Antigonus of Socho, Joshua ben Perachja, Simeon ben Gamaliel, and especially Hillél, remind us of certain prominent passages in the gospels said to have been spoken by Jesus. The authenticity of these passages in the pre-Christian Jewish literature has been questioned, but without sufficient reason. Carefully avoiding any foolish theory as to this spiritual side of Judaism,—such as that notable but groundless statement by Renan, "Hillél is the master of Jesus,"—it is clear to me that we ought to give due honour to this feature of Judaism. The party was, no doubt, numerically weak,—lost in the crowd, perhaps,—but still, it existed; some have remembered it from time to time; and modern liberal Judaism is the fruit (perhaps not yet ripe) from that precious seed.

It is important that all should know that modern Judaism is by no means *all* narrow, literal, legal, ceremonial, and ignorantly traditional. Judaism exists in two prominent forms:—(1) Talmudic and scriptural, (2) rational and critical. The former party quotes the Bible and the Talmud as unquestionable infallible authorities; the latter applies its reason and its conscience to the Bible, and frees the soul from the burden of the traditions. The former lives in the past; the latter thankfully accepts the increasing knowledge and light of the present.

Now, though in this connection I say nothing of orthodox or Talmudic Judaism,

Digitized by Google

I do contend that in reformed Judaism the idea of God has been developed, purified, exalted, until now it is almost the absolute religion. This part of the Jewish church is gradually but surely quitting its Hebrew limitations and widening out into the pure, simple, universal faith which is at the bottom of most human creeds. In Germany, England, and America it becomes more and more enlightened, pure, tender, and satisfying to the deepest needs. I have often attended Jewish synagogues, and especially the reformed service. The harsher features of the liturgy are modified, the sermons would be acceptable to any assembly of religious persons whose theology is simple and enlightened; and I hesitate not to say, that I have frequently been *as* religiously benefited in a reformed synagogue as in a Christian church. There is, of course, one defect:—nothing is said about Jesus. The doctrine is Theism, not distinctively *Christian* Theism; but when the time comes (as come I feel sure it will) when the liberal Jewish community will freely and gladly acknowledge the eternally lofty position which Jesus holds in the religious history of the world, then that community will be more worthy of our good wishes and our respectful love than even it is now.

It seems to me that it is a sublime proof of the stability of our position as Unitarian Christians that other forms of faith tend by development to harmonize with it. Is it not a significant thing that Christianity with us, Judaism (in its liberal form), and Hinduism (in the hands of Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen), are moving towards a harmonious world-wide unity? When we, as Unitarians, reflect upon our comparative numerical insignificance, should it not be a joy and strength to us to note the evident movements of Divine Providence in this matter? The Infinite One, in his sublime and irresistible slowness, is bringing the various creeds of Christendom into unity, and is elevating the different faiths of the world into that pure and absolute religion which shall one day cover the earth, and be professed and practised by every soul. We are allowed to work together for the promotion of this important end. Let us do all we can. Let us, in view of this object, whatever we feel compelled to say as to the Phariseeism of the time of Jesus, stretch out a friendly helping hand to reformed Judaism, and help to bring it yet nearer to perfect faith and love.

JEROBOAM'S GOLDEN CALVES.

IT was the custom among the nations of antiquity, when one was conquered by another, or for any reason would do homage to the other, to accept its gods, and emblems of worship. When Jeroboam, in rebellion against Rehoboam, had made himself King of Israel, he set up two golden calves as objects of worship; one at Dan, at the northern end of his kingdom, and one at Beth-el, at the southern end (1 Kings xii. 28.) This we must suppose that he did on the grounds above stated, in order to show his gratitude to the King of Egypt, who had saved him from Solomon's anger, and by whom he was very much helped in gaining the throne of Israel. How long these golden idols remained in these towns we are not told. But they would naturally be an object of plunder to the first invader. Before the end of Jeroboam's reign, the town of Beth-el was captured by Abijah, King of Judah (2 Chron. xiii. 19.) And a very few years later, in the reign of Baasha, the town of Dan was captured by Benhadad, King of Syria (1 Kings xv. 20.) After this, though these calves are never forgotten as a reproach against Israel, we hear no more of them in those towns, or as objects of worship anywhere.

These calves would seem to have given rise to the narrative in Exodus xxxii., where the Sons of Levi are said to have put to death three thousand men for worshipping Aaron's golden calf. That narrative was probably written during the course of the century following Jeroboam's reign, and intended as a reproach to his conduct.

When Jehu usurped the throne of Israel, he followed up his crimes by an attack upon the worship of Baal, and an endeavour to establish the worship of Jehovah in the northern kingdom. Hence he is not likely to have allowed the wor-

Digitized by Google

ship of these calves, if we could believe them to have been in existence; and when the southern historian says, that Jehu continued in the sins of Jeroboam in the matter of the golden calves, we must understand it only as a reproachful way of saying, that he continued in his hostility to the house of Judah, whose King he had begun by slaying,—and to the Levites, who claimed that all sacrifices should be sent up to Jerusalem (2 Kings x.)

Two hundred years after the time of Jeroboam, when Hosea reproaches Ephraim with being idolatrous, saying "Thy Calf" [or God] "O Samaria, hath cast thee off," we need not suppose that they worshipped any such idol; he merely taunts them with Jeroboam's golden calves of days long since past. So, when he quotes the southern proverbial reproach against the northern priesthood, saying, "Let them that sacrifice, being men, kiss the calves," we are merely to understand that the priests of Jerusalem chose to consider all the northern priests as idolators, because they sacrificed at any other spot than on Mount Moriah. The jealousy between the two halves of the nation was such that we must not believe to the letter all the reproaches flung by one against the other. As angry theologians now reproach one another with being heretical, so the Hebrew theological reproach was that of idolatry. Ezekiel, when in captivity, expresses his contempt for those left behind in Jerusalem by saying, that he had a vision in which he saw them polluting the Temple of Jehovah by the worship of all manner of unclean beasts.

S. S.

SIN SET FORTH UNDER VARIOUS ASPECTS BY THE BIBLE WRITERS.

I.

HOW clear an insight into the depths of the human heart the Bible writers show! How active and vigorous the moral eye with which they looked upon human duties, and on the graver matters of transgression and sin; how carefully they distinguished these into their various classes, and set them before us in the different lights in which our different powers of conscience regard them! Let us consider some of these one by one.

1. Sin, a wrong done to our fellow-creatures.

God has given to each of us a SENSE OF JUSTICE, with impulses that lead us to avenge the wrong, and to rush forward to help the injured. In our head-strong courses we sometimes forget the injury we do to all around us; but these sensitive feelings awaken the memory, and call us to an acknowledgment of the needful reparation. When King David had indulged his ungoverned desire to possess the wife of Uriah, and in order to compass this end had wickedly contrived the death of the husband, Nathan's parable of the little ewe lamb brings his guilt before him in living colours, and all too late he owns the base and cruel injustice he has committed.

2. Sin, a defilement.

We find within us PERCEPTIONS OF PURITY, a reverence for innocence, a sense of the duty of holiness, which leads us to regard anything we do amiss as a pollution, a stain, a foul spot that cries out to be cleansed. When the Bible speaks of sin in this light, God's pardon is a washing away of impurity. "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sins," prays the Psalmist. But writers so earnest for a thorough, practical reformation as these, give us little hope that the cleansing shall be accomplished without our own labour and effort. "Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes. Cease to do evil," writes Isaiah, putting his words into the mouth of Jehovah. And again, "Cleanse your hands ye sinners, and purify your hearts ye double minded," says the Apostle James. Very difficult or impossible is this process when long time and habit have made wickedness into a second nature. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" asks

Digitized by Google

Jeremiah; and again, the same writer, when upbraiding the land of Israel with her foulness, declares, "though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine inquity is marked before me, saith Jehovah." Hence only, too surely, in a degenerate age, priestly ceremonies were allowed to take the place of moral effort; and in the book of Leviticus, we find one day set apart for a ritual purification. "On that day shall the priest make an atonement for you that ye may be clean from all your sins before Jehovah."

3. Sin, an offence to our sense of duty.

God has placed within us a STANDARD of right and wrong, and he has, moreover, laid a compulsion upon us that we should continually weigh our conduct by it. Mortifying as the task must sometimes be, we seem unable to shirk it, and to escape from it. When the weight of our sins grows heavy upon us, the burden becomes almost unbearable, and men have been known to give themselves up to punishment and to death long years after their crime had been committed and forgotten, in order to free themselves from the load of their guilt. Thus Judas, when he had received in money the reward of his treachery, finding himself unable to enjoy his ill-gotten gains, brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the Temple, we are told, and went and hanged himself.

4. Sin, a debt to God.

God has given to us powers and talents of various sorts, and has lent us a freedom of choice whether we will turn them to mischief or to usefulness. But he has not been willing that we should look upon this freedom as other than an entrusted charge. To which end he has put into our consciences a BELIEF THAT WE ARE ACCOUNTABLE to Him, and that we shall one day be called to a reckoning for the work that we have done. When the Bible speaks of life in this light, our duties are the dues we owe to God, the rent-service we are bound to pay Him as Lord of the soil, and omissions of payment become debts. Something like serfdom, with various and very oppressive exactions from the tenant, seems to have been common in Palestine at the time of Jesus. In many of his parables our life is likened to the work of cultivating the ground, and trading with its products, for the profit of the landlord; and since it is impossible that the best of us should not often fall short of what is expected of us, he encourages us to look for some forgiveness from a wise and forbearing Master. "Forgive us our debts," he bids us pray, "as we forgive our debtors." The slave that owed ten thousand talents to his lord was probably one of these trading slaves, who, through a bad harvest, and ill-luck in the market, found himself unable to produce the exhorbitant sum demanded of him.

ON RELIGIOUS INSINCERITY.

SIXTY years ago, when Unitarians might have been sent to prison for three years for openly denying the Trinity, and even thirty years ago, when they might have lost their chapels for the same reason, they naturally thought it wise to be quiet as to their opinions; and very few made any effort to spread the truth. In mixed company they held their tongues on the subject. They rarely professed themselves to be Unitarians; and hence no orthodox persons of good breeding ever spoke of us as Unitarians. Since that time, however, the case has altered; and it has now become our duty to try and spread our opinions, to give to our neighbours the benefit of the truth, and no longer to hide it under a bushel. Of course there are many of the older school of Unitarians who still avoid the use of the name, who keep their opinions in the back ground, and who think it wrong to make proselytes. But such timidity is fast going by. Unitarians are now awakening up to the duty and the pleasure of spreading the great truth which has been intrusted to them; and success is rewarding their efforts. They call themselves Unitarians, and are called so in return, and thus our very opponents help us to bring on the discussion, which is all that is necessary to insure to truth its victory in impartial minds. But un-

Digitized by Google

fortunately all minds are not impartial or fairly open to reason. We have two difficulties to overcome. The first is ignorance. The second, the more formidable, is conventional insincerity. There are thousands of well informed people, truthful in all other matters, who are content to be untruthful in matters of religion; who will go to a place of worship and profess what they do not believe, who would not do the same in a Court of Law. We have hitherto too much overlooked this class of minds. We have, in politeness, reasoned as if Christian worshippers, regular attendants at their church, were of course sincere. We must dismiss that politeness, and do what we can to dissuade men from the hollow insincerity of using words in two senses, of professing a creed in public to which they in their own breasts give one meaning, while they are well aware that their hearers give to it another meaning. No such quibbling is allowed in a Court of Law, in dealings between man and man. For six days in the week men are expected to be honest; and can it be right to be dishonest on the Seventh Day? We seem to have got a new reading of the old Commandment: "Six days shalt thou tell the truth; but on the seventh day thou mayest tell falsehoods, when within the temple of thy God." We ought not to shut our eyes to this. We ought not to be silent about this insincerity. It is corrupting the nation; all who palliate it and excuse it are to blame, and are partakers of the guilt. Let us therefore, for the future, not be content with showing that believers in orthodoxy are wrong in logic; let us also endeavour to persuade those who profess orthodoxy without believing it that they are morally wrong, are doing an injury to their own souls, and to their neighbours by the bad example which they are setting.

SAUL AND THE WITCH OF ENDOR.

IN the 28th chapter of the First Book of Samuel it is related how Saul, on the eve of a great battle with the Philistines, commanded his servants to seek out a *Witch*, whom he might consult as to the issue of the impending conflict; how such a woman was found, to whom Saul repaired by night; how she raised the spirit of the prophet Samuel; and how that spirit foretold the defeat of Saul's army, and the death of the monarch himself. Now, what are we of the present day to think of this narrative? For myself, I have not the slightest hesitation in proclaiming my utter disbelief in all alleged *Witchcraft*, either present or past, either to be found recorded in our English history, or in the pages of the Bible; and hence I can come to but one conclusion, that this whole affair was a clever piece of trickery on the part of the woman,—an imposition, which was rendered all the more easy and successful by the disturbed state of the king's mind, and the no less disturbed state of the king's' conscience. In scanning the narrative closely, it strikes one immediately that Saul himself saw no apparition, saw nothing out of the ordinary course of nature; but that every thing unusual that is *said* to be seen, was seen by the woman; and, so far as we can judge from the history, by her alone. In the 12th verse we read, "And when the *woman* saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice." Saul, so far, had seen nothing; for he says to her, in the 13th verse, "Be not afraid; for what sawest *thou?*" She replied, "*I* saw gods [Elohim, *a* god, *i.e.* a spirit] ascending out of the earth." Still Saul himself had seen nothing; for he asks, in the 14th verse, "What form is he of?"—a perfectly useless question, if there was anything visible actually before him. To this query the woman replies, "An old man cometh up, and he is covered with a mantle." Then the verse adds, "And Saul perceived that it was Samuel." Yes; but how perceived? —not by the evidence of his own eyes, for he had himself seen nothing, but "perceived" on the testimony of the woman, whose pecuniary interest it was to play upon his fears, yea, and whose very life was in danger if she failed in her pretended necromancy. "And Saul perceived that it was Samuel, and he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself." Probably he remained in that position to

Digitized by Google

the end, too full both of awe and terror to lift up his face in the presence of his old master, whom he believed to have left the quiet grave, to tell him his own fate, and that of his family and throne. The voice, assumed to be that of the Prophet, is easily accounted for on the supposition that the woman was a *ventriloquist*, and could therefore make her intonation as solemn and sepulchral as she chose, and to proceed from whatever quarter she might select. It is much easier and more reverential to believe this, than to believe that the Most High would give one human being the power of summoning another at will from the calm repose of the tomb; or than it is to believe that He occasionally imparts to the most degraded of our race the faculty of prying into the secrets of His councils, concerning which Christ said, even to his chosen Apostles, in Acts i. 7, "It is not for *you* to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power."

Notwithstanding what appears to us, of this highly enlightened and philosophical age, the inherent improbability, nay, the absolute impossibility, of human intercourse with, and influence over, the denizens of the spiritual world, yet such a superstition prevailed universally among the ancient Hebrews, in the time of Moses and his immediate successors; and was even made the subject of legislation in their sacred books. To take but a few examples. It is enacted in Exodus xxii. 18, "Thou shalt not suffer a *witch* to live;" and in Leviticus xix. 31, "Regard not them that have *familiar spirits*, neither seek after *wizards* to be defiled by them: I am Jehovah, your God;" and in the same book, xx. 27, "A man also, or a woman, that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, *shall surely be put to death.*" Having thus the direct and positive authority of the Bible, not only for the existence of witches, but for the extermination of witches, we can scarcely wonder at the numerous and barbarous executions for this purely immaginary crime which took place in almost every state in Europe, between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries. In the province of Como in Italy, a thousand alleged witches were put to death in a single year. At Toulouse in France, four hundred alleged witches were executed in one day. A judge of Nancy in France boasted that he had put to death eight hundred witches in sixteen years. In Geneva, five hundred were burned alive for this crime, about the year 1515, in the short space of three months; and it has been calculated that one hundred thousand must have suffered on the same account in Germany alone; while England, and especially Scotland, was little behind in the career of superstition, and of slaughter. And yet all the hosts of victims were absolutely innocent, that is, of the specific crimes for which they suffered; for they had no intercourse with Satan, and they had not purchased from him power over the inferior demons of his court; for the simple yet all-sufficient reason, that there was, and is, no Satan, with whom to make such an unholy compact.

Having, as we have seen, the express declarations of Holy Writ as to the reality of Witchcraft, and having also the express commandments of Holy Writ for the extirpation of its members, it is scarcely to be wondered at that even conscientious, that even religious men, should have aided in perpetrating all the atrocities of which a few examples have been given. That they could do so, however, and at the same time feel convinced they were worthily discharging their duty towards God and their fellow-creatures, implies that they must have laboured under some fearful mistake as to the nature and character of the Bible. What was that mistake? What can it have been save a belief in its *plenary inspiration?*—that every book, and chapter, and verse, and word of it was dictated by the Holy Spirit? and that they were bound, in consequence, to prostrate their reason before all its assertions, and their consciences before all its requirements? The men of those benighted ages could not perceive, as we are privileged to do, that neither the Old Testament nor the New was ever intended to instruct us in history or in science, and especially not as to the cause and cure of mysterious bodily ailments; and that on all subjects save strictly religious and moral ones, these books possess no special authority. Nor could they perceive, as we do, that the writers of the sacred volume, while frequently inspired on the great topics of God, and Duty, and Responsibility, and Immortality, were not, in other matters, a hair's-breadth in advance of the times and lands in which they dwelt; necessarily partook of the ignorances and even

Digitized by Google

of the superstitions of their countrymen; and chronicled those ignorances and superstitions in their various works. Nor could they perceive, as we do, that, while receiving with joy and gratitude everything in the Bible which had a tendency to make them wiser, better, and holier, and acknowledging such portions to be unquestionably divine; they were privileged to reject all that militated against the changeless perfections of God, and especially His holiness, righteousness, mercy, and love; and to regard such portions as purely human, and therefore imperfect, and therefore unauthoritative. Thus, *wrong notions of the Bible* led them to believe that witches really existed; *wrong notions of the Bible* led them to believe that witches should be put to death; *wrong notions of the Bible* led them to murder hundreds of thousands of their helpless, and to a large extent innocent, fellow-creatures. How vastly important, then, it is, not only for our theory but for our practice, that we should all acquire correct views of the nature and claims of that blessed Book, so as to feel assured which of its teachings, and which alone, claim our profoundest reverence and our heartiest allegiance!

R. E. B. MACLELLAN.

THE CASE OF THE REV. W. KNIGHT OF DUNDEE.

WE can only notice what to us are the permanent results which, from time to time, appear in this case. With the ignorance and the unchristian spirit shown by men who hold to a professed service of the gospel of Jesus we might find much ground for comment; but such is not our purpose. In our last number we expressed dissatisfaction with the Rev. Mr Knight's paper in the *Contemporary Review* for August, and we feared that it was to form the basis of his conduct in respect to his Presbytery. We are glad to learn, from the report of the meeting of Presbytery held on the 11th ult., that our fears have not been realised. The committee appointed to meet him failed to obtain from him "a repudiation of the Unitarian "body as forming no part of the Church "of Christ." We may be pardoned if we express our own gratification that there has arisen a man who sees that Christianity is not dependent upon any church or creed. Mr Knight's words are as follows:—

"I have been asked 'to repudiate the Uni-
"'tarian body as forming no part of the Church
"'of Christ.' I cannot do so. Of no man, or
"no body of men in the world will I presume
"to say that they do not form part of the
"Church. For an individual to do so is to as-
"sume a prerogative he is not entitled to ex-
"ercise. For a Church to do so is to arrogate
"to itself a function beyond its charter. To
"require such a repudiation seems to me ut-
"terly unreasonable both in its legal and its
"moral aspects. I find nothing in the New
"Testament—the primary manual of Church
"law—nothing said by Christ to sanction it;
"and I find nothing in the Standards of the
"Free Church to support it."

And again,—

"Holding, therefore, that the Founder of the
"Church is the sole Legislator as to its limits,
"I wish farther to state to the Court that the
"Unitarian body, which I am asked to de-
"nounce as no part of the Christian Church,
"has absolutely no existence as a denomina-
"tion amongst the various sects. If there
"were such a denomination Mr Martineau and
"many others associated with him would not
"belong to it for a day. There are a number of
"worshipping societies, principally composed
"of the descendants of Presbyterian Noncon-
"formists, in which the majority or the whole
"of the members have ceased, it may be per-
"manently or it may be temporarily, to be
"Trinitarians. But the extent of their devia-
"tion from the old theology is of every variety,
"is wholly undefined by accepted or unaccept-
"ed formulas, and is in no case beyond that of
"natural sympathy a condition of membership
"or communion. It is not an organised de-
"nomination; and nine-tenths of its pulpits are
"by legal trust deed open and free as to the
"doctrine to be taught in them."

We cannot help remarking that Mr Knight shows a much better acquaintance with the Unitarian Position than he did at the former meetings of the Presbytery, when he vaguely referred to "Unitarian-"ism as a dogmatic religious system," as having none of his sympathy, and in that he is at one with Unitarians. We have no "dogmatic religious system," in the popular sense attached to the words. The above extract from Mr Knight's last address does our position—so far as it goes—justice. Here is what Mr Martineau said, at Liverpool, last year:—

Digitized by Google

"I would fain see our churches preserve "themselves in such a mood, that if ever the "world around should change towards them— "should remove its bars and restrictions, and "should be prepared for a large and compre- "hensive Christianity—our churches shall not "be hindered from throwing ourselves into this "greater and wider embrace."

And now, let us notice the opposite spirit in the Presbytery. The Committee report that they tried to impress upon Mr Knight "that Unitarians, as a body, had "well-defined articles of belief or unbelief "destructive of doctrines which we, in "common with all the churches of Christ, "cannot but regard as essential to the "being of a church of Christ." If this statement is to be taken literally, the first part of it is false. There are as many forms of Unitarian belief as Unitarians, by which we mean, that no Unitarian creed exists—at least, in this country—that has any authority beyond itself as an expression of Unitarian views. Dr Wilson, Mr Knight's strongest opponent, and whose church is in the same street as Mr Knight's, said:—"The Christian Church "is not founded on any philosophical "speculations whatever;" to this Unitarians will be found to assent. Again, "The only harm any philosophical specu- "lation ever did the Church was when "an attempt was made to incorporate "these speculations with Christian Faith." This is what Unitarians have always been trying to convince the world; and the main reason why Unitarians have to give heed to philosophy, is to be able to take out of such a document as the Confession of Faith the philosophical speculations, and restore to the hearts of mankind a long lost brother in Jesus of Nazareth; at whose feet we hear no philosophical speculations, but a dealing with the facts of common life by appeals to common sense. The doctrine of the Trinity is a philosophical speculation; and one of the earliest advocates of the Deity of Christ, Justin Martyr, was first a heathen philosopher, and after he became a Christian, continued to wear the philosopher's cloak. We do not agree with Dr Wilson's application of the Apostle Paul's words to Mr Martineau, "Let him be accursed." Of course, the Pope could do no more.

The Presbytery appear to have lost heart, and have practically given up their prosecution. They made a grievous mistake when they undertook to determine the limits of the Church of Christ. But it was the instinct of self-preservation that moved the consistent Calvinists. Mr Knight accepts of the decision in so far that he will not appeal against it, so that the prosecuting party have only exhibited their own weakness. Let us hope there will result from the discussion an attempt at least, to reconstruct the whole Christian Church upon Jesus' own basis. "By "this shall all men know that ye are my "disciples, if ye have love one for an- "other."

Mr Knight is not yet free, for a committee has been appointed to examine an article in the *Contemporary Review*, a sermon preached in Glasgow, and also that preached in Mr Martineau's chapel.

THE UNITARIAN MISSION.

IT is being forced upon Unitarians that a more important work is to be demanded of them than hitherto they have felt called upon to attempt. A conversation between a Unitarian and Trinitarian brings out a very decided distinction between the two in the way of looking at religion, and what it means to man. We have no right to speak for other Unitarians, yet we are confident that it is not difficult to show very nearly what most of us think and believe. If orthodoxy be the only possible means whereby man can become acquainted with God, then we cannot reach that position. With almost every feature of the Popular Theology we find ground for objection. The infallibility of the Scriptures is insisted upon by those who claim our submission, and we are unable to profess such a belief in their theory as would satisfy them. And yet we believe in the Scriptures. They are read every Sunday in all our chapels throughout the land. Our ministers take their texts from the Bible, and use as helps the examples and wise words of the men of old. The Unitarian regards the worship of the Bible as a serious mistake, and sees no warrant for it in the Bible itself,

Digitized by Google

or in the demands of truth. Yet the orthodox churches require their members to declare their belief that the words of a printed book are the Words of God. And yet there are professed orthodox Christians who quietly tell you that they do not believe this, though their connection with a church that does would lead us to suppose they did.

A minister and a layman will probably speak of the word of God in two senses; —the layman's word of God is the English version of the Bible. The minister would probably refuse to commit himself to the layman's position; he, at least, retires to the original Hebrew or Greek. The manner of regarding the Scriptures among the popular churches is very unsatisfactory. The difficulties increase with advancing knowledge; and, instead of a frank acknowledgement of difficulties in the Bible, the attempt is made to cry them down, and to abuse those who discover them. The result is, oftentimes a man hears attacks made upon the Bible itself, and cannot resist the conviction that, with the orthodox view of the Bible, everything stands or falls. The Unitarian offers a more reasonable view of the Bible. He does not ask for a concession from the inquirer before the book is opened. He reads the Bible as he reads any other work, and makes such allowances as the times of the writers require. In short, the Unitarian does not say the Bible is free from error. He reads it in the light of reason and conscience, and does not worship it. To us this way of regarding the Bible is of the greatest advantage; we are not afraid of science or history. If the world was not made in six days, or if there was no Garden of Eden, or universal deluge, these are not what makes the Bible valuable to us. We do not go to the Bible for geology or astronomy, but to find records of men who felt the nearness of God, the comfort of hope, the strength of faith, and the might of love, so that by comparing our experience with theirs, we may see where we may lay hold upon eternal life. We think just as much of the Bible as the orthodox. We do not accept their view of it. The Unitarian holds the Bible was made for man, and not man for the Bible. To make this plain is one part of the mission work the Unitarian Church has to perform, and in it all may take part. And then, it is important to establish the principle of the different values to be attached to the various contents of the Scriptures. The Unitarian is found to differ from the orthodox in this,—the latter insists that all the Bible contains is above the reason of man, and that any attempt at selecting a part as being better than the remainder is unchristian. The former, however, holds, that to read the Bible at all, it must be read with freedom, and allowing the reader to say this is good, that is less good. In this way Unitarians, without any effort on their part to act together, have generally come to the position that as Christians we are mainly concerned with the teachings of Jesus. If it be allowed that in the Gospels we have a true record of the words of Jesus, then, in those words must be found the first principles of Christianity. If we believe that Mary, who sat at Jesus' feet and heard his word, had chosen "that good part," and was an accepted disciple, we do not doubt but that to learn the same lessons which she learned will also enable us to appreciate the Gospel of Jesus. The great advantage of the Unitarian thought about the Bible and the nature of Christianity is, that it makes religion much simpler and more easily understood than the Confessions and Catechisms which are so often presented as the sum and substance of religion. Dean Stanley, at St Andrews lately, in a sermon, remarked upon the difference in value to be attached to the teachings of Scripture:—"He (Jesus) confirmed the plain truth of common sense, that there is a distinction even in sacred things; that we must even in these select; that there is a good, a better, and a best; that there is a true, a truer, and a most true." Let the Dean's principle be carried out, and it will be found that the mind will at last rest in the words of Jesus as the essence of Christianity. In these remarks we have only sketched a small portion of the work which every Unitarian may undertake. We have dared outgrow our fathers' Theology, and when we estimate the gap that separates us from the orthodox, we can best understand the alarm which may seize the timid who look upon us, but fear to stand by our side. At the same time, the light which in the Providence of God has been entrusted to our charge must not be hid.

Digitized by Google

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

TENTH LESSON.

THE CHARACTERISTIC LETTER.

THE Characteristic Letter of a Verb in ω is, as we have said, the letter (or letters) that come before the final ω in the Present Tense. And now we have to notice that this letter is changed according to a regular method in certain other tenses, as we show below.

Notice that those with λ, μ, ν, or ρ for characteristic, are called *Liquid Verbs*, have no change of characteristic, so take no σ in the Future.

Characteristic changes thus:—

Present.	Fut.	Perf.	Perf. pass.	1 Aor. pass.
π, β, φ, πτ,	-	ψ	φ	μ	φ
κ, γ, χ, γγ, κτ, ζ, σσ, ττ,	ξ	χ	γ	χ
τ, δ, θ, ζ, σσ, ττ,	-	σ	κ	σ	σ
λ, μ, ν, ρ,	-	-	κ		
ω pure (with vowel before it),	σ	κ		

For example take διωκετε, *follow ye*, on line 7, with characteristic κ, and it will change thus—

Present.	Fut.	Perf.	Perf. pass.	1 Aor. pass.
διωκω,	διωξω,	δεδιωχα,	δεδιωγμαι,	εδιωχθην.
I follow,	I will follow.	I have followed.	I have been followed.	I was followed.

Now, from these five the remaining tenses all copy their characteristic, as we see partly on the Table of Active Tenses in Lesson Eight.—The 1st Aorist copies the Future; The Pluperfect copies the Perfect; The Imperfect (and the 2d Aorist with a slight difference) copies the Present.

Now, the Table in Lesson Eight only gives the Indicative Mood, while there are six Moods, and most Tenses run through all six with differing Tense-endings: but notice that each Tense keeps its own characteristic through every mood, and this is a great help to us in recognising the Tenses.

So also if there is any irregularity of spelling told of in the dictionary as belonging to any particular tense (as there very often is, especially in the 2nd Aorist), that irregularity will be found in that same tense in every mood. Now let us turn to our text.

1 Thessalonians v. 13.

1 ειρηνευετε εν εαυτοις. Παρακαλουμεν
Be ye at peace among yourselves. we exhort

2 δε υμας, αδελφοι, νουθετειτε τους
And you, O brethren, warn ye the

3 ατακτους, παραμυθεισθε τους ολιγοψυχους,
unruly, comfort ye the feeble-minded,

4 αντεχεσθε των ασθενων, μακροθυμειτε
support ye the weak, be ye patient

5 προς παντας. Ορατε, μη τις κακον
towards all. Take heed lest any one evil

6 αντι κακου τινι αποδω· αλλα
instead of evil to any one should give back; but

7 παντοτε το αγαθον διωκετε και εις
always the good follow ye both towards

8 αλληλους και εις παντας. Παντοτε
one another and towards all [men.] always

9 χαιρετε. Αδιαλειπτως προσευχεσθε· εν
rejoice ye. Unceasingly pray ye; in

10 παντι ευχαριστειτε·
all [things] give thanks;

Now we will examine some of the compound words in our Text. In the first word: we are familiar with ειρηνη, *peace*. Then παρα-καλουμεν, *we exhort* (or divided, *we call beside*.) Line 3, παρα-μυθεισθε, *comfort ye* (divided, *speak beside*); also ολιγο-ψυχους, *little souls*, we remember *oligarchy* or *government* by a *small* number; also αντ-εχεσθε, *support ye* (divided, *hold against*); notice that αντι has dropped its ι to make way for the beginning vowel of εχεσθε. Line 6, απο-δω, *should give back*, from απο, *back*, διδωμι, *I give* (one of the Verbs in μι), Future, δωσω, *I will give*, δω, *should give*, is 2nd Aorist Subjunctive. Line 9, the Adverb α-δια-λειπτως, *unceasingly* (*not-with-leaving*); α added at the beginning of a word is a negative, as also on

Digitized by Google

line 2, α-τακτους, *not-in-order*, line 4, α-σθενων, *not-strong*. Line 9, προσ-ευχεσθε, *pray ye unto;* line 10, ευ-χαριστειτε, *give thanks*, ευ is *well*, χαιρετε, *rejoice;* we have adopted eulogise, *to praise*, literally, *to speak well of*. Notice that χαιρετε, *rejoice*, is a *liquid Verb*, its characteristic is ρ, so there will be no change of characteristic, and it will have no σ in the Future.

NOTES OF PROGRESS.

DEAN STANLEY AT THE UNITARIAN POSITION.

A minister of the Church of England in Scotland seems like one out of his proper element. He is there a dissenter from the Church by law established; sometimes he presents an air of superiority, which, however, fails to meet any recognition; at other times he associates with Presbyterians upon a ground where the differences do not appear strongly marked.

The Dean of Westminster has, on several occasions, preached in Scotland, and his sermons have been remarkable for their simplicity, and for the homely subjects with which they have dealt. At St Andrews, lately, he gave one of these sermons to a large audience in the Parish Church. That he should have sought to meet his audience upon common ground is what might have been expected, but that he should have cleared away the corruptions of orthodoxy—leaving the ages of Presbyters and Bishops, the Councils and Churches of eighteen centuries, and settle down by the side of the cautious Unitarians, who fear to sever Christianity from the living representation of it in the historical Jesus—is more, perhaps, than his audience may have anticipated. Accordingly, like Unitarians, he places the centre of truth respecting Christianity with Jesus. He called up the lawyer who asked Jesus the question "What shall I do to inherit Eternal life?" and, of course, the Dean did not find reason to show that Jesus demanded belief in the Athanasian Creed, or the Five Points of Calvinism. He said:—"The lawyer knew what he was about. He did not ask, What am I to think, or What am I to say, or What am I to feel? but What am I to do? He knew something of the great doctrine everywhere proclaimed in the Bible, 'He that doeth righteousness is righteous.' He was only perplexed by wishing to know how he should do what was right. This principle, too, our Lord recognised. He sanctions the principle that to do is the great thing." This is enough to justify the heading of this paragraph. For Unitarians have stood on that foundation a long time; and we feel some pleasure in finding an eminent clergyman of the Church of England in this respect with us.

In the Annual Report of the Northumberland and Durham District Unitarian Association, the Committee "rejoice to believe that there never was a time when Unitarianism in this district manifested so much life and vigour, and so earnestly endeavoured to walk in the path which the providence of God seems to have marked out for it." "Three new chapels are being erected."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Christianity & Modern Thought. Boston American Unitarian Association. London: H. Brace, 178 Strand.

This volume contains the discourses that were delivered in Boston, during last winter, in response to an invitation of the Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association, whose purpose was declared, in the letter of invitation, to be, "to meet the need of thoughtful people perplexed amid the materialistic and sceptical tendencies of the times, . . . and in the interest of a free and enlightened Christianity, to present freshly the positive affirmations of faith." The contributors are, the Revs. H. W. Bellows, J. Freeman Clarke, Athanase Coquerel, Orville Dewey, C. C. Everett, Frederick H. Hedge, James Martineau, Andrew P. Peabody, G. Vance Smith, and Oliver Stearns.

Four Sermons in English: By Pasteur Athanase Coquerel, of Paris. London: Longman's; H. Brace, 178 Strand. Price 1s 6d.

These sermons have been recently preached in Paris, in the Salle St Andre, 29 Cite d' Antin, where Mr Coquerel occasionally gives a service in English for the benefit of such English speaking residents as desire what is substantially Unitarian teaching and worship. The first sermon was also preached at the Anniversary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association in London. Of these sermons we can say, what we cannot always remark of the sermons of Unitarian preachers, great thoughts are here stated in the plainest words. The unlearned reader, instead of feeling it a loss that the preacher is not an Englishman, will rejoice that in his poverty of words he comes down to the level of those who use only simple forms of speech, but whose case is often forgotten by some who undertake to expound the simple gospel. There is also a directness of appeal which is worthy of notice, as for instance—"Young girls, show in your whole life what devotedness, what empire over herself, what purity, what moral elevation, a Christian young woman can have. There are veiled lamps that diffuse through a whole house the purest light, hurting no eyes, charming and mild to all."

Hymns in Prose, for Children: By Mrs Barbauld. Sunday School Association, 178 Strand, London. Price 3d.

We are glad to see an old favourite brought out in a new form. Parents who wish for a little work from which they may read to their children should procure this. It makes a capital Sunday School reading book.

Digitized by Google

SELECTIONS FROM WRITINGS OF REV. W. E. CHANNING, D.D.

MILTON, LOCKE AND NEWTON.

"We are unable within our limits to give a sketch of Milton's strong reasoning against the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ. We must, however, pause a moment to thank God that he has raised up this illustrious advocate of the long-obscured doctrine of the Divine Unity. We can now bring forward the three greatest and noblest minds of modern times, and, we may add, of the Christian era, as witnesses to that Great Truth, of which, in an humbler and narrower sphere, we desire to be the defenders. Our Trinitarian adversaries are perpetually ringing in our ears the names of Fathers and Reformers. We take Milton, Locke, and Newton, and place them in our front, and want no others to oppose to the whole array of great names on the opposite side. Before these intellectual suns, the stars of self-named Orthodoxy "hide their diminished heads." To these eminent men God communicated such unusal measures of light and mental energy, that their names spring up spontaneously, when we think or would speak of the greatness of our nature. Their theological opinions were the fruits of patient, profound, reverent study of the Scriptures. They came to this work, with minds not narrowed by a technical, professional education, but accustomed to broad views, to the widest range of thought. They were shackled by no party connexions. They were warped by no clerical ambition, and subdued by no clerical timidity. They came to this subject in the fulness of their strength, with free minds open to truth, and with unstained purity of life. They came to it in an age when the doctrine of the Trinity was instilled by education, and upheld by the authority of the Church, and by penal laws. And what did these great and good men, whose intellectual energy and love of truth have made them the chief benefactors of the human mind, what, we ask, did they discover in the Scriptures?—a triple divinity? three infinite agents? three infinite objects of worship? three persons, each of whom possesses his own distinct offices, and yet shares equally in the Godhead with the rest? No! Scripture joined with nature and with that secret voice in the heart, which even idolatry could not always stifle, and taught them to bow reverently before the One Infinite Father, and to ascribe to him alone, supreme, self-existent divinity."

TRINITARIANISM DESTROYS THE DIVINE PERFECTIONS.

"But the worst has not been told. I observe then, that if Three Divine Persons are believed in, such an administration or government of the world must be ascribed to them as will furnish them with a sphere of operation. No man will admit three persons into his creed without finding a use for them. Now, it is an obvious remark, that a system of the universe which involves and demands more than one Infinite Agent, must be wild, extravagant, and unworthy the perfect God; because there is no possible or conceivable good to which such an agent is not adequate. Accordingly, we find Trinitarianism connecting itself with a scheme of administration exceedingly derogatory to the Divine character. It teaches that the Infinite Father saw fit to put into the hands of our first parents the character and condition of their whole progeny; and that, through one act of disobedience, the whole race bring with them into being a corrupt nature, or are born depraved. It teaches that the offences of a short life, though begun and spent under this disastrous influence, merit endless punishment, and that God's law threatens this infinite penalty; and that man is thus burdened with a guilt which no sufferings of the created universe can expiate, which nothing but the sufferings of an Infinite Being can purge away. In this condition of human nature, Trinitarianism finds a sphere of action for its different persons. I am aware that some Trinitarians, on hearing this statement of their system, may reproach me with ascribing to them the errors of Calvinism, a system which they abhor as much as ourselves. But none of the peculiarities of Calvinism enter into this exposition. I have given what I understand to be the leading features of Trinitarianism all the world over; and the benevolent professors of that faith, who recoil from this statement, must blame not the preacher, but the creeds and establishments by which these doctrines are diffused. For ourselves, we look with horror and grief on the views of God's government which are naturally and intimately united with Trinitarianism. They take from us our Father in heaven, and substitute a stern and unjust lord. Our filial love and reverence rise up against them. We say to the Trinitarian, Touch any thing but the perfections of God. Cast no stain on that spotless purity and loveliness. We can endure any errors but those which subvert or unsettle the conviction of God's paternal goodness. Urge not upon us a system which makes existence a curse, and wraps the universe in gloom. Leave us the cheerful light, the free and healthful atmosphere, of a liberal and rational faith, the ennobling and consoling influences of the doctrine which nature and revelation in blessed concord teach us, of One Father of boundless and inexaustible love."

NAME OF CHRISTIANS DENIED TO UNITARIANS.

"Why are the name, character and rights of Christians to be denied to Unitarians? Do they deny that Jesus is the Christ? Do they reject his word as the rule of their faith and practice? Do their lives discover indifference to his authority and example? No, these are not their offences. They are deficient in none of the qualifications of disciples which were required in the primitive age. Their offence is, that they read the Scriptures for themselves, and derive from them different opinions, on certain points, from those which others have adopted. Mistake of judgment is their pretended crime, and this crime is laid to their charge by men who are as liable to mistake as themselves, and who seem to them to have fallen into some of the grossest errors. A condemning sentence from such judges carries with it no terror. Sorrow for its uncharitableness, and strong disapprobation of its arrogance, are the principal feelings which it inspires."

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

No. 11. NOVEMBER 1872. PRICE 1D.

THE BIBLE WHEN INTELLIGENTLY READ.

NO book was ever read and studied under such disadvantageous circumstances as the Bible. By those who call themselves its warmest admirers it has been placed above all criticism, it has been declared to be perfect and faultless in all its parts, and all of it equally addressed to us, and fitted to our circumstances. On the other hand, those who have seen from the mistakes, the contradictions, and the inconsistencies in it that this high ground claimed for it cannot be logically maintained, have been too ready to put it aside as not worth the study required to understand it. To neither of these do we now address the following remarks, but to a middle class of readers, our own Unitarian friends, who may be described as halting between the two extremes, and acting a wiser part, but a less logical part than either of them.

Though the several books of the Bible were not addressed to us, but to those who were living at the time when each book was written, yet we may derive most valuable instruction from it. But how much of it is useful for our instruction depends upon the amount of study given to it. A careless reader can find very little in the Old Testament suitable to himself beyond about one-third of the Psalms, a small part of the Prophets, and perhaps the interesting life of Joseph. He wishes that much of it had never been written, because he cannot see the drift of it. Though he rejects the orthodox opinion that it was addressed to us, yet he presists in the orthodox blunder of reading it as if so addressed. For example, he sees no good reason for our being forbidden to eat pork, and he judges from the Gospels that the command was little obeyed in Gallilee, and he concludes that it is an unwise, or at least unnecessary command. So it seems if addressed to us in England; but to the inhabitants of the warmer country of Judea it may have been a very wise command of the Hebrew lawmaker, whoever he was. So, in every case, before declaring a part of the Bible to be uninstructive, let us enquire for whose instruction, and under what circumstances, it was written, and we may perhaps gain instruction from it for ourselves. When the Almighty, in Isaiah, says, "Bring no more vain meal-offerings, incense is an abomination to me; the new-moon-days, and sabbaths, the calling of convocations, I cannot endure;" a little study of the circumstances of the people to whom these words were addressed will teach us that the prophet was rebuking the ritualism, and the attention to ceremonies in worship, which may be as much a fault in our days, and even among Unitarian dissenters, as among the Jews in the reign of Hezekiah. When the writer of Ezekiel xliii. says, "Upon the top of the mountain the whole limits thereof round about shall be most holy," a little study will teach us that, like the Apostle Paul, he wished for the

Digitized by Google

removal, or rather non-erection, of the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles; and that when Jesus drove the dealers out of the "unconsecrated" part of the temple-yard, he was following up this humane law of Ezekiel xliii., and rebuking those who, like the priests, after the return from the Captivity, would again introduce the narrow priestly intolerance of the the former times. Ezekiel himself was a priest of the most narrow exclusive school, who, when he and his fellow-friends were all carried into captivity, had a vision in which he describes the worship carried on in Jerusalem by the poor who were left behind; and he supposes, as they had no priests among them to burn incense lawfully, that they were all worshipping unclean animals. But when we give to every part of the Bible its own date, we shall find that the later chapters in Ezekiel's book were written in the very opposite spirit from the earlier chapters. They may be all equally instructive, but only when we have learned to whom they were each addressed. They may then be used to reprove those who would put an altar rail between the more holy and the less holy parts of a church. Instances without number might be brought forward to show that valuable instruction may often be gained from passages which, like this in Ezekiel, seem, to a careless reader, most unprofitable.

WHO ARE THE SCEPTICS?

THE word sceptic, so often applied in the present day to those who reject the orthodox views of Christianity, and which is so used to express condemnation of their supposed "doubt" and "disbelief," might, we think, be applied more justly to those whose views seem to us to be incompatible with a belief in some of the highest attributes of God. Those who hold the doctrines usually considered so essential to Christians, must, we maintain, doubt and disbelieve—*firstly*, in the omnipotence of God. They assert, for instance, that God, in creating the human race, designed that it should be perfect in goodness and obedience to His commands, but was, thwarted in this intention by a malevolent being, who, corrupting and seducing the first created man and woman, they fell into sin and disobedience, and became deserving of endless punishment. They, surely, should also be looked upon as sceptics, who "doubt" and "disbelieve," *secondly*, in the justice of God,—who maintain that God not only condemned to eternal punishment the first guilty pair, but all their innocent descendants for ever after, viz., the whole human race. Such sceptics disbelieve, *thirdly*, in the mercy of God, since they affirm that He could only be appeased by the death of an infinitely good being,—and by such a sacrifice was alone willing to relieve mankind from the vindictive penalty laid upon it.

And now let us consider the derivation and true meaning of this word sceptic. Consulting the Greek Lexicon, we find that it comes from the verb *skeptomai*, to "look carefully at," to "examine," to "consider," and taking the word in this its original meaning, we may readily accept the title of sceptics. We may hasten to acknowledge that we "examine" and "consider" how far the popular notions of God's character are fit to be entertained by His creatures, and that when we "look carefully" into scripture we find little to justify the rise of such doctrines. We see clearly that the few texts which are supposed to support such unworthy conceptions of our Father in heaven are immensely outbalanced and outnumbered by the oft-repeated assurances given in scripture of His love, justice, and mercy. We are told there that God is "like a father who pitieth his children." That "He sendeth rain on the just and unjust." That "He is ever ready to forgive;" and that "He delighteth in mercy." We see also that all the designs of God in the creation of the universe are proofs of His benevolence and good-will to man. Perceiving all this, we should be quite ready to accept, in its true sense, the name of sceptics—so often reproachfully conferred upon us, and be willing to adopt it as a title of honour,—for better far is it to reject boldly and openly doctrines which impugn the character of God, and are at variance with a

Digitized by Google

belief in the attributes which our consciences assure us must be His, than to trouble ourselves about a few passages in scripture which have been interpreted so as to ascribe to Him that which we should condemn in the character of one of our fellow-creatures.

SIN SET FORTH UNDER VARIOUS ASPECTS BY THE BIBLE WRITERS.

II.

5. Sin a disobedience to God.

God has given us, we say, the power of directing our actions according to our own will; but, by the frequent failures in our attempts, he has made our presumption to be tempered by feelings of our weakness. In this way, in all religious minds, there arises a SENSE OF DEPENDANCE upon God who made us; and our notions of duty naturally shape themselves in some measure into that of obedience to him. The Hebrew books constantly teach this duty of obedience to God's commands. Sin of every sort is disobedience to his word, transgression of his law; and punishment, in this view, is a necessary chastisement, the rod of a wise father for the correction of a rebellious son. When we turn to the later part of the volume we find the meaning of our heavenly Father's discipline beautifully explained to us in the New Testament; and a cheerful and intelligent habit of working under a Father's rule becomes a marked feature of the Christian religion.

6. Sin hateful to God.

We are formed to admire and approve virtuous actions and to condemn wrong-doing. We cannot choose but to love goodness and to detest vice. We find in other men pretty uniformly the same instincts, and we are brought to the conclusion that God who made us and placed within us these strong DISAPPROBATIONS OF VICE must himself delight in virtue and abhor sin. In the warmth of our feelings we go further, and take for certain that he hates the sinner also. "Thou hatest all workers of iniquity," writes the Psalmist. "Jehovah will abhor the bloody and deceitful man."—Ps. v. 6. When we have ourselves done wrong we begin to detest ourselves, and to fear that God also detests us. The Bible continually represents God as thus moved by human passions; and while it bids us turn and do right that we may avert the outward consequences of our wrong-doing, it gives us hope of softening the feelings of God towards us by humiliation before him and the confession of our sins. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper, but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy."—Prov. xxviii. 13. So in the New Testament we are told that the tax-gatherer who smote upon his breast and prayed, "God be merciful to me a sinner," went down to his house justified, or assured of God's pleasure in him through his humility.

7. Sin a disease, or deformity of the mind.

God has given us feelings of SATISFACTION IN DOING RIGHT. There is a sort of wholesomeness in doing even a laborious duty. We feel cheerful, we breathe freely, our appetite is good, and we are in health. Painfully depressing are the opposite symptoms. The figure of ill-health for ill-conduct is often used in the Old Testament. When the nation has fallen into wickedness, the Hebrew writer declares that "the whole head is sick and the whole heart faint; from the sole of the foot even to the head there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises and putrifying sores." "Balm of Gilead" and "healing medicines" are tried in vain for its cure. And the same language is used of the misdeeds of individuals. "Heal my soul," the Psalmist prays to Jehovah, "for I have sinned against thee." In the New Testament, Jesus transfers the figure to himself, and likens himself to the physician come to heal the sick. By a somewhat similar metaphor

Digitized by Google

in the Bible, doing right is spoken of as uprightness, and the way of the wicked as crooked. God has made man upright, it is we ourselves that have worked out our own deformity. The ancient Pagan philosophers, who by reason of their polytheism had but little notion of sin as connected with our duties to God, were careful observers of the constitution of their own nature, and wrote largely about wrong-doing as a deformity or disease of the powers of the mind.

8. Sin a breach of covenant with God.

God has planted within us certain NATURAL BELIEFS and expectations that rise up in our minds without our being able to give any account of them, and these expectations are in the Bible spoken of as promises. Thus the protection, the help, the indulgence, and all else that our nature bids us hope for from a wise and good God who made us, are, in the Bible, said to be promised to us by the spoken word of God; and since conscience will not suffer us to disconnect the notion of a promised benefit from that of some sort of dutiful return, these writers represent God as making a covenant with his children. He is to be their God, their friend, their leader, and their King; they are to obey his laws, to remember his words, to be loyal to him, to keep themselves from the worship of all other gods. The duties, therefore, of a faithful adherence to their religion, and of a scrupulous morality, were, by this means, connected together. On the one hand, sin was a forsaking of the covenant made with God; and on the other hand, any deviation from the worship of the one true God was in itself a sin. In the New Testament, we have the same idea of allegiance to God in other words. To live in ignorance and wickedness is to be in the bondage of Satan. We cannot, we are told, serve two masters; we cannot serve God and Mammon. Jesus' religion is a New Covenant. The pagan converts to Christianity are said to have turned "from idols to serve the living and true God." In the Epistle to the Romans we are reminded, that to whom we yield ourselves servants to obey, his servants are we to whom we obey, whether of sin unto death, or of obedience [to God] unto righteousness.

Under so very many, and perhaps under yet a few more less frequently used figures, have these writers set sin before us, showing how gravely they looked upon it, how carefully they took their estimate of it from the natural feelings of their own hearts, without ever once making light of small faults, or regarding the boundary between right and wrong as laid down by any one less sacred than God.

RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES BELIEVED BY UNITARIANS.

By the Rev. JOHN WRIGHT, B.A., Bury.

No. 4.—THE LOVE AND PROVIDENCE OF GOD.

WHEN man believes that there is a God, the first question he asks about God is, does He care for human beings? Is He full of love towards us, or utterly indifferent to us, or wrathful and hostile towards us? There are few believers in God who systematically maintain that He hates the creatures He has formed, or delights in hurting and tormenting them. Probably there are no Christians who allow that any doctrines they teach involve the ascription to the Deity of cruelty or injustice. But it is not uncommon for persons to speak and think of God as so far removed from us that He can have no personal relation towards the individual human being, as having created and set going the machine of the universe and never more interfering in it; those who speak thus abandon the idea of providential care and love.

It is generally considered that this view is the result of the teachings of Science. Every new discovery and advance of knowledge among scientific men adds fresh weight to the truth, which may be now considered as positively established,

Digitized by Google

that all parts of the universe are governed by a few great, simple, fixed principles. These act uniformly, without deviation or exception. The astronomer can in consequence foretell the exact position of a planet at some future period, the chemist knows beforehand what will be the result of a combination of substances, the mechanician can calculate the effect of the forces he applies. Nothing like caprice is known in the phenomena of the material world. The great "natural laws" are never broken or departed from. There are no exceptions in favour of individuals, or on account of moral considerations. Poison equally kills the saint and the sinner. The ship suffers the same from the storm, whether it carries priests or pirates.

Does this prove that nature is merely mechanical, and that there is no supreme Will governing the universe? The notion that it does arises from the fact that we are accustomed to find every human will acting with changeableness, and hence get the idea that it is a characteristic of *will* to be so uncertain that it is impossible to predict what it will do. Hence we are apt to imagine that the more freedom of will any agent has, the less uniformity there will be in the action. But this is the result, in human beings, not of their possessing wills, but of their ignorance and short-sightedness. They have to change their plans and adopt new courses because they have not foreseen the circumstances that occur, or are disappointed as to the results that they expected. A man on whose conduct you can never count beforehand is not for this reason regarded as having a strong will, but is looked on as deficient in clearness of thought. If an undertaking is conducted on one unbroken system, we say that the manager shows that he laid his plans carefully and carried them out with resolution. If God arranged the whole of creation in the first instance with infinite wisdom, and has never found it necessary since the commencement to alter the arrangement, this does not prove that his will is not prepetually active in carrying out the great principles of his government. "The laws of nature" are the plan according to which God acts. It is the glorious peculiarity of the Divine Causation, that He preceived the end from the beginning, and while ruling the universe on system, according to unbroken laws, at the same time thus works out the greatest good for each individual. The same Will that first called into being the frame of nature, continually supports it and maintains its harmonious working, and thus blesses every creature He has made. God creates every leaf and flower, directs every cloud and breeze and tide, keeps the heavenly bodies moving in their appointed orbits. Growth is slow creation. The force employed to maintain the order of nature is none the less real, because it is guided by such wisdom as to render its action regular and uniform.

But men sometimes think that the love of God would be more evident if He would depart from his plan to suit their individual convenience. Consideration however will show that such exceptions would be most injurious. Which of us would dare to ask for a change of weather to meet his own wants, when he remembers how much loss it may inflict on his fellow creatures? If we were in doubt whether the properties of natural objects will remain the same, if the fire that burns today might perhaps only warm to-morrow; if the same substance were sometimes food, sometimes poison, we should be utterly unable to direct our course of action. If the ship sent out unfit for a voyage were nevertheless preserved amid the storm by the direct interference of God in one case, the result would be carelessness in the fitting out of other ships, from the hope that the same might happen again. All human forethought, care and activity would thus be put an end to. It is for the true good of man that the divine plan, which we call "the laws of nature," should be constantly adhered to. It must not however conceal from us the great truth that God's wisdom so arranges that plan, that it is for the real benefit of each individual as well as of the race as a whole, and his Providence orders for each of us that position and those circumstances which tend to our true and lasting well-being. He cares for us, not by breaking the laws of nature, but by causing them to work together for our good.

The peculiar relation in which God stands to human beings is best expressed by calling Him, "our Father." There is no love, known among ourselves, as pure, unselfish, unvarying, as that of the parent for his child. We use this therefore as a comparison whereby we may show how great is the love of God. This fatherly

Digitized by Google

love of God is the great central doctrine of Unitarianism. We believe in it without reservation or exception. We at once and for ever reject every doctrine that contradicts it. We do not couple with it the idea of any partiality or limitation, but rejoice to think the love of God streams forth, like the light of the sun over the world, embracing and blessing every creature He has made, wearied out by no rebellious conduct, reaching even the unthankful and the evil. This love watches over each one of us, knows and cares for our individual wants, strengthens us when we are weak, raises us when we fall, fetches us back when we wander, never afflicts except to do us good, never lessens, changes, or ceases, but continues the same for ever and ever. The manner in which Jesus Christ enforces and illustrates this truth makes his teaching truly "good news" to men, especially to the lonely, forlorn, neglected, suffering outcasts on earth, as he tells them that even *they* are loved by the universal Father, with a tender compassion beyond all that the human mind can conceive or the human heart can feel.

This doctrine of the Infinite Love of God is sometimes said to be inconsistent with the fact that there is much suffering among men. The reply is:—1. So far as this suffering is the result of the natural laws above referred to, it is, as has been shown, much more conducive to the general welfare that the uniformity should be preserved, than that exceptions should be made to meet the cases of individuals. 2. A very large part of the actual suffering men endure is produced, not by the laws of God, but by the breaking of those laws. The constitution of our bodies, minds, and souls, shows us the great natural laws by which the Creator desires they should be governed. When we refuse to be guided by these, and injure ourselves by intemperance, carelessness, idleness or overwork, and sins of various kinds, the consequences are painful. But if you take away all the suffering caused by man's folly and sin, the amount of pain left in the world will be comparatively small. That God causes the infraction of the natural laws to be followed by pain is a proof that He loves us, since He thus warns us when we are going wrong. 3. Whatever suffering is strictly the ordination of God and cannot be avoided by any amount of care and virtue in man, is the instrument by which the Father educates his children. The greatest good of which man is capable consists in the growth and strength of the higher parts of his nature, the moral and spiritual powers; such a result is emphatically helped on by trial, and struggle, and all the discipline of sorrow. There are many examples of this. Those nations are not the greatest who live in regions where very little toil is required to obtain the necessaries of life, but those who have to work hard and meet difficulties and dangers. The most eminent men in every department are those who have conquered obstacles, not those who have had every thing made smooth and easy before them. Each of us may trace some of his best qualities to a season of suffering or a period of struggle he has had to go through. Thus the darkness and the storm, as well as the light and the sunshine are, when rightly understood, the messengers of love and the proofs of the goodness of God.

Think of the many means of happiness possessed by every one. The body, with its organs and senses, is the source of many pleasureable sensations; the taking of food, which is necessary for our existence, is at the same time a means of constantly returning gratification; the eye and the ear, which are needful to enable us to do our work in the world, are at the same time the vehicles for giving us delight by beautiful sights and sounds. Social relations of various kinds are the source of life-long happiness. The mind cannot be employed without enjoyment in its every exercise, imagination and memory rivalling each other in the pleasures they confer. To do right is not only made our duty but also the source of true happiness, the conscience having a peace of its own, which is virtue's great reward. The worship of God and the love of Him are joy beyond expression. Thus the whole of our constitution is ordered for our good. Not less do the features of the world we inhabit teach the same truth. Every thing needed is done for us, and we have only to do our part well, to find the earth

> "A mansion fair and spacious for its guests,
> And all replete with wonders—"

a source of ever increasing instruction and delight.

But it is useless to try to prove that

Digitized by Google

God loves us to one who has never felt that love. As the child needs no argument to satisfy it of its mother's affection, so the human soul should be conscious of the Divine love, with a certainty beyond all logical inference. The considerations here brought forward may be useful to remove doubts and difficulties. But the heart must be touched as well as the reason convinced. Let man try to feel the love of God, to have a lively gratitude to Him for his mercies, to depend on Him with entire trust as on a Father, and he will have, in this assurance of a Divine Love ever supporting him with providential care, the greatest comfort, help, and blessing which human beings can possess.

A JEW SPEAKING FOR HIS RACE IN EDINBURGH AND DUNDEE.

A recent article on Liberal Judaism in the *Unitarian Missionary* acknowledges the debt of gratitude that we, as Christians, owe to the ancient Hebrew nation, and recognises, moreover, the Jewish community of today as a band of fellow-labourers with ourselves in the great work of God—the establishment of a purer religion over the earth. It remains only for us to add, that a fellowship and interchange of thoughts with this people is one of the great means for the religious advancement of our own minds within our reach in these days.

This thought is pressed upon us by Professor Marks's short but rich sketch of the oppressions and endurances, the difficulties, the industry, the steps taken in a liberal study of the Bible, and the gradual gain of a better social position for the Jews in modern Europe, which he gave in two lectures at the Philosophical Institution in Edinburgh, and to the Young Men's Christian Association in Dundee, in November and December last. A mere glimpse at the history of this remarkable people, perhaps even so very slight a glance as the small pamphlet containing these lectures* will afford, would help us to rate their value a little higher than we have sometimes been willing to do, and would make us ready to grant, what the author asserts for them, "their claim to the title conferred on them by prophetic scripture of the witnesses of God—'Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord.'"

The first of these lectures, beginning at the Reformation, gives us the condition of the Jews in Germany, Austria, and Poland, where, trodden under foot and ground down, the objects of hatred and prejudice, debarred from social intercourse, from office and even from scientific and industrial pursuits, they yet managed to keep the spirit alive within them; and with the first day-streak of a more humane and tolerant age at the beginning of the last century, there arose among them learned students and brilliant authors, translators of the Bible, and philosophical writers. Despite the difficulties they have laboured under since that time, in every branch of mediæval study, in Oriental and philological literature, the Jews have occupied a foremost place. It is worthy of note how large a number of the daily newspapers and periodical publications of the present day, more especially in Germany, are edited and conducted by Jews. There is hardly a trade, profession, or art which they have not helped to advance. They are powerfully represented in music, painting and sculpture, in science pure and applied, in belles lettres and politics, in each of which branches of intellectual excellence every European country derives a considerable part of its renown from the activity and labour of its Israelite children. Do we wonder that such a people should cherish the conviction that they are being preserved for a lofty purpose and for a glorious time, when the truth they have so long garnered up shall be brought forth, and they shall be seen to be the instruments, under a Divine hand, for establishing the doctrine of THE ONE GOD upon earth?

The second lecture strikes even more home to our consciences, as it relates to the legal position and uphill progress of the Jews in our own country. After mentioning their banishment from England by an edict of Edward I., and their admission under Oliver Cromwell, it gives us an account of the restrictions laid on them by

* The Jews of Modern Times: Two Lectures by the Rev. Prof. Marks. London: Vallentine.

Digitized by Google

the English laws, the struggles they went through, and the gradual lifting off of all their disabilities one after another up to the present day, when they stand among us "an ancient people, still in the full possession of their religious identity, risen from the desperate fortunes into which fifteen centuries of social and political ostracism had sunk them, occupying a high position in every country of Europe, and more numerous at the present time than they were in the palmy days of David and Solomon;" a primitive race, that, contrary to all general experience, has "held together for nearly four thousand years, defying all the rude shocks of time, and resisting every attempt made for crushing out their communal life." We may almost forgive them if, conscious of such a remarkable providence, they comfort themselves under their afflictions with the words—"Fear thou not, my servant Jacob, for I am with thee; I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee; but of thee I will never make a full end."

In the opening words of his first lecture Mr Marks says—"It was something like a surprise, not to myself only, but to many to whom I communicated the fact that I, a minister of the synagogue (of reformed Jews in London) should have been invited by a public body of Scotsmen to lecture;" and he proceeds warmly to congratulate the society that it "has taken a step which promises fairly to break down the barrier that has too long intercepted the interchange of mind and mind on the narrow and unreasonable grounds of the differences of religious belief."

It need give us no surprise, after looking over these two lectures, that the eloquent and accomplished Israelite professor should have been thus invited, welcomed, and listened to with delight at Edinburgh. Nor, after all the changes in the direction of liberal thought that have taken place around us, can we look upon it as anything extraordinary that toleration should have proceeded so far. But when the lecturer speaks of a future intercourse between the Hebrew and Christian mind, he expresses a hope we desire to re-echo. Toleration to the Jews is, not simply a duty, an attempt to repair past injury, the right of those whom no cruelty and oppression could render bigoted against their fellow-creatures, since the Talmud itself, written amidst the blaze of sanguinary persecution, could teach that "the pious of all nations will enjoy everlasting beatitude in the world to come." But, we repeat it, toleration, friendship, the exchange of intellectual advantages, nay, a readiness to learn from them even more than to teach them, may prove the best help to us to enlarge and exalt our knowledge of God.

UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY IN SCOTLAND.

THERE are sufficient reasons to be brought forward why the Unitarian Churches are less numerous in Scotland than in England. The same causes have not been in operation. The Scotch people never hear the Athanasian Creed repeated, except in an Episcopal Church. During the prayers in the Presbyterian Church, we think such expressions as are to be found in the opening sentences of the Litany are never used. Indeed, none of the doctrinal forms which are uttered by minister and people in the Church of England's worship, are ever heard in the services of Presbyterians. There are probably many public religious services conducted in Scotland in which Unitarians would not find much to object to on the ground of doctrine. The singing of the Psalms, being based upon the Hebrew worship, is a recognition of the unity of God; though it must be remarked the Church of Scotland has sanctioned the introduction of Hymns, and among them are seven *Hymns of the Trinity.* In these, however, there are several lines to which we have no objection; and more ingenuity than poetic inspiration is displayed in fitting in words, which no doubt seem an intelligible expression of something real to those who have used them, though to us they are but words, and nothing more—

"Jehovah,—Father, Spirit, Son,
Mysterious Godhead, three in One!—
Almighty God, to Thee
Be endless honours done;
The undivided Three,
Yet the mysterious One!"

Digitized by Google

Just four pages of the "Scottish Hymnal" are devoted to *Hymns of the Trinity.* In pleasing contrast to the dogmatic necessity which inserted them is the large portion of the book entitled *Hymns of the Christian Life*, of which there are forty pages. In this section there are many hymns to which Unitarians would object, such as that one beginning

> "There is a fountain filled with blood,
> Drawn from Emmanuel's veins,
> And sinners plunged beneath that flood
> Lose all their guilty stains."

There are, however, a few with which Unitarians are familiar; for instance

> "Nearer my God, to Thee."

a hymn written by an Unitarian.

We do not remember to have noticed any of the Broad Churchmen of Scotland protesting against the innovation of admitting the expression of dogma in the public worship of their Church. In some respects we do not doubt but that this Hymnal will lead to more discussions upon the doctrine of Jesus' deity and the blood theology than would have arisen from the Psalms of David.

It must be borne in mind that the discussion of doctrinal points has not taken the same direction in Scotland as in England. The chapels which were once the religious homes of Calvinistic Presbyterians in England, owing to the freedom of their congregations from dogmatic restraint, are now the meeting houses of Unitarians. And were not the churches in Scotland kept under by the Confession of Faith, they too would pass beyond the Calvinism which holds them. The Unitarian controversy has, however, been carried on for many years in Scotland. One of the first congregations was in Montrose, where now there is no Unitarian worship. About the year 1782 Mr Wm. Christie founded a church there of persons "all fixed and determined concerning the Divine Unity, and the supreme Godhead and unequalled dignity of the Father."

At present we must confine ourselves to an account of what is now being attempted. There are seven congregations in Scotland. There is a Unitarian Christian Association, having its headquarters in Glasgow. The annual meetings were held on the 13th and 14th of October. Sermons were preached by the Rev. Charles Clarke of Birmingham. On Monday the annual meeting of the subscribers was called at half-past six o'clock, and an hour after the soiree was to be held. This, together with the temporary absence of the secretary, led to a very hasty despatch of business in a most unbusiness-like manner. The annual report was read, but there was no time for a discussion of its contents. The business meeting was completely a failure. A whole day might have been taken up in a friendly conference. The soiree was held in the Trades' Hall, which was well filled. The feature of interest in the speeches was the forming of a new congregation in Glasgow, by the assistance of men and money from the St Vincent Street Church and friends from a distance. The Rev. W. Mitchell, late of Accrington, has taken the post of minister. We hope Mr Mitchell will succeed in the important work he has undertaken. After the enthusiasm attending the opening of such a mission has passed away, his labour will perhaps be greater than it is now, and for this his supporters should prepare their minds. We were pleased to meet Mr Webster, a young gentleman who has been preaching at Paisley, we believe a native of Glasgow, who spoke of himself as being a very old fashioned Unitarian. Dunfermline was represented by the Rev. R. S. Bowie, who has, for the past few years, been the pastor of a congregation of Unitarian Universalists. He gave a very earnest address, which was exceedingly well received. Other speakers were the Revs. R. B. Drummond of Edinburgh, J. Page Hopps of Glasgow, Charles Clarke of Birmingham, W. Mitchell, H. Williamson of Dundee, and Messrs G. Hope of Fenton Barns, and Alexander Bethune of Blebo, Cupar-Fife. The feeling produced by such a gathering certainly is that of encouragement.

Unitarians have a work to do in Scotland, and every day that work becomes more important. We want a thorough union of purpose and effort, and then our cause will find success in the North as well as the South; for, like Gladstone in the cause of reform, we can say, "Time is on our side." On every side the signs are evident that the religious position of Calvinism is losing its hold upon the public mind. The Unitarian Church offers a home to those who seek freedom and truth.

Digitized by Google

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

A TEACHER'S DIFFICULTIES.

WHEN a Teacher is led to think upon the work in which he or she is engaged, there often arises in the mind of a Unitarian Christian perplexity which leads to the doubting of one's power to do any distinct and clear work with the young. The orthodox Teacher has a well ordered course before him. There are hundreds of guides and books written with the view of making the child's mind acquainted with the words which, among grown-up people, are regarded as fair expressions of orthodox beliefs. It is needless to remark that the Unitarian gets little help from the above. In looking into them, he may find the best spur his own earnestness can obtain to give the young something better. It may be there are some Unitarians whose minds do not object to their using such books as "*The Pilgrim's Progress;*" and we have heard of such a strange book being given by Unitarian Teachers to one of their number. In such a case we are compelled to conclude that the term Unitarian is used in an exceedingly wide sense.

In trying to offer a word or two about a Sunday School Teacher's difficulties, we know very well that among Unitarian Teachers there are many who, though willing to teach history, geography, and any subject which has a recommendation of being useful, yet feel that the matter of personal religion is not so easily dealt with or so effectively introduced to their scholars. We know the Teacher's plea—"I would rather some one else, better fitted than I, should take my class;" and the ready way he or she can point out others who might do more. Alas that it is so! that the sense of obligation to one's fellow-creatures should be so very weak, and the belief in one's incapacity should lead so completely to doing nothing! The minister seeking Teachers for his Sunday School will certainly meet such discouragements. He cannot plead the case of the children as the orthodox minister can easily do, that their salvation in another world may depend upon a faithful Sunday School instruction! Unitarians in general, however, are not insensible to the claims of religion, though religion to them is in itself desirable, and is not regarded as a means of obtaining a distant reward. A clear understanding on the part of a Teacher of what his or her relation is to a class of young persons may remove much of that laboring in the dark which we fear is often the position of our Teachers. A Teacher in a Sunday School is in a far more important office than a Teacher in a day school. The latter is simply concerned in teaching certain branches of knowledge. The former, however, is in a religious position, and has many opportunities of bringing home the great principles of morality and Christianity to minds which may never again be so easily reached. If a Teacher really feels that in the providence of God he has had a work placed in his charge wherein he may do a real service to the cause of righteousness and truth, can we doubt that that Teacher will enter into his duties with as much zeal as he takes up the business of his daily toil?

Well, what do Unitarians desire to obtain for the young? Do they wish to make them repeat words, which, when put together, are statements of doctrine? We think we may answer, that Unitarians are most anxious to encourage and draw forth the natural powers of man, which, in the young, may be more easily reached than they can be in advanced life, when fashion, and care, and vice, perhaps, have obtained the greatest influence over him, and by careful training and instruction to give the hearts and minds of the young an inclination towards virtue and true nobleness of character. We aim at making true religious men and women. This is surely a good work, and also a practical one. No doubt it requires the Teacher to be religious and true. If our Teachers would think seriously of how they can best lead those children, who quietly submit to their influence on Sunday, to take an active interest in piety and morality, we believe the difficulties which they so often complain of would be much lessened; and, instead of going to their classes merely to deal with words, they would be there as the ministers of God in making plain the way in which the young must walk if they would fully receive the blessings of Heaven. For this work the harvest, indeed, is plenteous, but the labourers are few.

Digitized by Google

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

ELEVENTH LESSON.

ADJECTIVES AND PARTICIPLES.

ADJECTIVES.

AN Adjective qualifies a Noun, that is, shows of what kind the Thing is, as

βασιλειον	ἱερατευμα.	εθνος	ἁγιον.
a royal	priesthood.	a nation	holy.

DECLENSION OF ADJECTIVES.

In Greek, as in Latin, Adjectives are declined with Cases, Numbers, and Genders. Generally with three terminations, (one for each gender, like the Article ὁ, ἡ, το, *the*, given in Lesson 2), but some with two terminations (one for Masculine and Feminine, one for Neuter.) And some with only one termination for all three genders.

AGREEMENT OF ADJECTIVES.

An Adjective is made to agree with the Noun it qualifies; so that in whatever Case, Number, and Gender the Noun is, the Adjective is in the same condition. Thus on line 2, ἱερατευμα, *priesthood*, we find marked in the dictionary as Neuter, by having the Neuter Article το against it; and then if we search for the Adjective βασιλειον, *royal*, we find in the dictionary βασιλειος: ὁ and ἡ, the two Articles, standing to show the two Genders, Masculine and Feminine, and meaning that the word given is of those two Genders; and therefore since an Adjective has three Genders, this Adjective will be of only two terminations, thus, ος for the Masculine and Feminine, and (see Grammar) ον will be the Neuter; so βασιλειον, *royal*, is Neuter, agreeing with its Noun ἱερατευμα, *priesthood*.

PARTICIPLES.

Participles are often used for Adjectives; and they are declined like Adjectives of three terminations. The Participle Mood of a Verb (sometimes called the Adjective Mood) has this great difference between it and the other Moods—that while the Tenses in the Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative have all different endings to represent each of the three persons, I, Thou, He, and make no change for case or gender,—the tenses of the Participles have different endings to show all the Cases and Genders, but make no change for the different persons.

Singular Dual and Plural, they both change for.

1 Peter II. ix.

1	Ὑμεις δε,	γενος	εκλεκτον,	βασιλειον,	
	you But [are]	a race,	chosen,	a royal	
2	ἱερατευμα,	εθνος	ἁγιον,	λαος	εις
	priesthood,	a nation	holy,	a people	to
3	περιποιησιν,	ὁπως	τας	αρετας	
	a purpose,	so that	the	goodness	
4	εξαγγειλητε	του	εκ	σκοτους	
	you may declare	of the [one]	out of	darkness	
5	ὑμας	καλεσαντος·	εις	το	θαυμαστον
	you	having called	to	the	wonderful
6	αὐτου	φως·	οἱ	ποτε	ου	λαος,
	of him	light;	the [people]	once	not	a people,
7	νυν	δε	λαος	θεου·	οἱ	ουκ
	now	but	a people	of God;	the [people]	not
8		ηλεημενοι,		νυν	δε
		having obtained mercy, or, who had been mercifully treated,		now	but
9		ελεηθεντες.			
		having obtained mercy. or, who have been mercifully treated.			

Now, there are three Participles in our text, for εκλεκτον, *chosen*, is an Adjective altered from a Participle.

First, then, on line 5 we find

καλεσαντος.
having called.

This word is the genitive singular, masculine, of the 1st Aorist Participle καλεσας, and is declined like the Adjective πας, *all*.

Nominitive	π-ας,	π-ασα,	π-αν.
Genitive	π-αντος,	π-ασης,	π-αντος.

See Grammar.

It is in the genitive case for the same reason that του, *of the*, on line 4, is genitive, namely, to agree with *one person* [understood.]

Digitized by Google

Next, on line 8, ηλεημενοι.
having obtained mercy.
or, they who had been mercifully treated.

This word is the Nominative, Plural, Masculine, of the Perfect Passive Participle, and is declined ηλεημεν-ος, -η, -ον, it is Nominative, to agree, as does οἱ, *the*, on the same line, with *people* [understood.]

Next, line 9, ελεηθεντες.
having obtained mercy.
or, they who have been mercifully treated.

This is also Nominative, Plural, Masculine, Passive Participle, agreeing with the same Noun, *people* [understood], but it is 1st Aorist Participle, declined

ελεη-θεις, -θισα, -θεν,

from the Verb ελεεω, *I pity.*

Notice that on line 8 the Perfect Participle begins with η, and that η is the Reduplication which is found in every Mood pointing out the Perfect Tense. And now notice that on line 9 the 1st Aorist Participle has no Augment, for the Augment is found only in the Indicative Mood.

NOTES OF PROGRESS.

SEASIDE WORSHIP.

Services have been held in Blackpool under the auspices of the Missionary Conference, for three seasons. Those now drawing to a close have not been so well attended as those of 1870 and 1871, but the falling off is not great. The morning congregation averages sixty, and the evening about half that number—the offertory being 30s. weekly. These are only small results when the large resident population and the vast number of visitors are taken into account. But there seems a singularly small number of resident Unitarians, not more than a dozen families being known, and of these only a part are regular worshippers. The fact that the services are held during the summer only, when residents are almost as busy on Sundays as week-days, explains this apparent want of interest on the part of the Blackpool people. Of course large numbers of Unitarians visit the town, but some prefer open-air worship, and a few may take the opportunity of forming acquaintance with other denominations. Perhaps a still fewer number of Trinitarians may visit our services with the same object. Towards the establishment of a regular congregation at Blackpool very little has been done. The preachers are only visitors for the day—the services close with the season. There cannot be a Sunday School, so that permanent results are not to be looked for. If a regular minister could be appointed, winter worship and a school established, Blackpool would no doubt soon be numbered among our established congregations. Many missions have begun with far less promise, and many old congregations, with all the appliances of a good Chapel and schools, and the prestige of a long history, would be glad if they could number up as well as Blackpool. The room is a beautiful apartment deserving the name of a hall (it is one of the apartments in the "Hall by the Sea,") in a good situation, and comfortably seated. The preacher, by slightly inclining his face to the right, has a full view of the sea, and, on clear days, sees the Welsh mountains on the horizon. The sound of the waves comes in by the open windows, and the subdued tread of many passing feet is not inaudible, but there is no disturbance of prayer or praise. Those who have attended these services must have felt that the hour devoted to worship with fellow believers from various congregations has heightened their enjoyment of both sea and land during the other hours of the day. O. J.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE RELIGIOUS TEACHING IN VARIOUS BELFAST PULPITS TRIED AND FOUND WANTING; being the substance of a Discourse delivered in the Non-Subscribing Church, York Street, Belfast: By John Jellie. Price 2d.

We quote the following, which will indicate the general tone of the discourse:—"The essence of Unitarian Christianity is love—love to the Universal Father, and love to our brethren of mankind, from the well-beloved Son of God to the very humblest of God's rational children. Most cordially can the Unitarian, when he is true to the genial spirit of his theology, join in praising God and saying,—Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men. With him our Father in heaven is not a monster whose predominant desire is to have full satisfaction for every transgression committed by his frail children, nor a vindictive tyrant who visits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children in a way directly opposed to our natural sense of right. With the Unitarian, our Father in heaven is a Father to be loved,—an infinitely good Being, who, in the fulness of his love, has caused his sun to shine on the evil and the good, and who, when the world was sunk in ignorance and depravity, sent his well-beloved Son to seek and to save that which was lost, or fast falling to decay. And, in his opinion, God is the Father of all men, and, consequently, black and white, bond and free, Roman Catholics and Protestants, Trinitarians and Unitarians, aye, Heathens and Christians, are brethren—some of them, doubtless, in error in many respects, all possibly in error in some respects, and, so far as they are in error, to be set right rather than abused, to be conciliated rather than provoked, and, in some instances, to be pitied rather than blamed."

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian and Universalist Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Edited by Henry Williamson, Dundee.

No. 12. DECEMBER 1872. PRICE 1D.

THE CASE OF THE REV. W. KNIGHT OF DUNDEE.

AT the last meeting of the Dundee Free Presbytery a Committee submitted a report of its examination of the publications of Mr Knight. These were, a sermon preached in Glasgow, entitled, "Christian Ethics;" another preached in Little Portland Street Chapel, entitled, "Seeking after God;" and the paper which appeared in the *Contemporary Review*, on "The Ethics of Creed Subscription." All of these were declared to be wanting, in either a doctrinal or moral point of view.

The Knight case has presented itself under two aspects, one we may term Catholic and theological, the other has reference to morals. Mr Knight's preaching in Mr Martineau's pulpit, and joining in worship with Unitarians was so extraordinary, that all who had no fear of the Church before their eyes declared it a most noble and Christian proceeding. Mr Knight thereby told the world plainly enough that he felt it possible to recognise men as religious who differed widely from his Church in belief. There need not be a sacrifice of principle in a Trinitarian joining in Unitarian worship, because it is the case that the Trinitarian goes as far as the Unitarian, and passes beyond him. The case is different when a Unitarian attends Trinitarian worship. Here another object of worship may be introduced, which goes to compromise the Unitarian. It is therefore much easier for Mr Knight to worship with Unitarians than it would be for Unitarians to join Mr Knight.

It has long been a desire on the part of Unitarians to convince their fellow-christians that there may be found a platform upon which they may all meet as religious men to worship the One only true God. There are members of Trinitarian churches who have felt this too, and who believe that it is not right that religion should have a less uniting power than trade, or amusement, or science has for mankind. Mr Knight gave a practical example of this. But his fellow-presbyters saw that he had done more than unite in worship with Mr Martineau,—he had quietly allowed that Unitarians might be able to render acceptable worship to the Father. The general public in Dundee appear to have approved of Mr Knight's conduct, and in many cases we believe laymen felt the justice of allowing Unitarians to take the name of Christian. After spending a vast number of words, the Presbytery gave up their attack, leaving Mr Knight where he was before.

Now, let us notice the moral side of the case. The public at first simply regarded Mr Knight as a free man, who acted from generous motives, and the claims of the Presbytery were disregarded. But the Presbytery have a power over Mr Knight. He has signed a bond, he is not a free man, he has promised to recognise the authority of his brethern, and when the public applause had died away, the quiet work of persecution began. And then appeared in a Review the article on Creed Subscription, in which Mr Knight maintains that

Digitized by Google

one may sign a creed in the "plural" and not in the "singular." Here is a moral point to be fairly considered. This is plain enough to the public. A man signs an agreement or bond in a commercial way, and no tampering is allowed to be made with the manner of signing. The law of the land holds the person responsible for his signature. The Presbytery now bring a charge of want of frankness and honesty against the position taken up in the article of the *Contemporary*. And we cannot see how Mr Knight can deny the charge. The Presbytery have all signed the same Creed, and they are alarmed at the manner in which Mr Knight refers to doctrines which, though his Church considers them of the greatest importance, he intimates that the individual who signs the Creed is not obliged to think them as fundamentally important.

It is a very great misfortune that the important Catholic question involved in Mr Knight's fellowship with Unitarians should have given place to a discussion upon a simple matter of morality, which we must think, by ordinary laymen, will be settled against Mr Knight. To have the stigma of heresy is an honor, but the insinuation of a want of moral courage, or of a due sense of right, cannot but prove detrimental to a Christian reputation.

Unitarians are Liberals in Theology, but if we know them they are bigots in morals, consequently we approve of Mr Knight's position in one respect while we regret it in another. The discussion will encourage us "to labor and to wait."

THE TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL.

A Jewish newspaper lately proposed to send Mr Stanley, who had succeeded in finding Dr Livingstone, on a second search to find the lost ten tribes of Israel. Whether the writer was in earnest may be doubted; but it may be as well to explain the origin of that old belief that the ten tribes had been lost, and were a proper object of search. A little study of history would show how groundless was the fancy, and how unlikely such a search is to be rewarded with success.

The ten northern tribes were carried into captivity by the Assyrians, and placed as colonists in some of the waste lands of their wide territory. The two southern tribes were carried off about an hundred and twenty years later by the Babylonians, who, before that time, had conquered the Assyrians; and thus both bodies of captives now became bondservants of the same masters. While thus living in captivity in the spots where they had been placed, the two halves of the nation may have continued in some degree separate; but when freedom was granted to them by Cyrus, and they were at liberty to return home, or to move about in the land of their dispersion, the distinction began to be lost. When Cyrus appointed Zerubbabel, of the royal family of David, to be governor of Judea, he gave to the Jews of the south a political rank which the northern Israelites did not possess. Many of the northern Israelites then followed Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Chron. ix), and these, after a time, lost their distinctive parentage, and became Jews. A few others of the northern Israelites returned to their own home, and were afterwards known as Samaritans. These retained their old hostility to the Jews. But they were not many; the temptation for them to return home was not great. Probably the larger part of the northern Israelites remained in the dispersion. But they lost all their old jealousy against the Jews. By the nations among whom they dwelt they were all alike thought to be Jews. They themselves were also willing to be thought Jews, since the existence of Jerusalem as an honoured capital gave to the name of Jew a rank which the northern Israelites had not. Hence, if we now enquire what has become of the ten tribes, the answer is easy. The individuals, each for himself, were willing to drop their caste, and to be lost among the members of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, who scattered themselves over Europe, Asia, and Africa. Probably a century hence some enquirers will be in vain seeking for the French who settled in Canada, and for the Germans who settled in the United States. They will both be lost among the population around them. The search for them will probably be fruitless, as has been the search for those of the ten tribes who did not return home when they had permission to do so. S. S.

Digitized by Google

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE ATONEMENT DOCTRINES.

WE Unitarians seem to have but little concern with the doctrines of EXPIATION, SUBSTITUTION, PROPITIATION, and SATISFACTION, and the other lesser parts of the popular system of the Atonement. We believe them to be, one and all of them, founded upon mistaken notions, and we give to them no place in our religion. However, we live surrounded by large masses of people who think these doctrines of importance, and cling to them in the earnest belief that if they fall to the ground all morality must go with them. We cannot suppose that they may be lightly pushed aside, or that they will perish of themselves if left alone. If we wish to be useful among our fellow-creatures we must study their thoughts and understand their difficulties. It may therefore be of interest to us to inquire whether the like mistakes were made by religious-minded men in the most ancient times, and how far the Bible writers recognise and labour to correct these blunders. This then will be our present task, to search for anything like the above mentioned doctrines in the Old Testament. Some future time we may go further and inquire what has given to the Atonement doctrines this firm hold upon men's minds, and again, whether the Bible has any teachings of its own to offer in their place.

1. Was the doctrine of EXPIATION known to the older Bible writers?

Perceptions of the foul stain left upon the soul by deeds of cruelty, injustice, and dishonesty, with the restless desire to purge away the defilement, are as old as anything we know of human nature. And as far back as history will carry us we meet with the various superstitions by which this was supposed to be accomplished and a sanctification effected. Thus among the ancient Greeks in the time of Plato, 500 years before Christ, there were certain itinerant priests who went round from house to house performing sacrifices and incantations, persuading people that they had a power given them from heaven to make expiations by these means for any crimes committed by the individual himself or by his ancestors. (Republic, 2, 364.) Tacitus, the Roman historian, writing in the first century after Christ, describes the sacrificing of animals and the sprinkling of water at the grand ceremony of purifying the newly built temple of the Capitol at Rome. (Hist. 4, 53.) The Bible pages show us that the notion of sanctification by shedding of blood was common among the nations around the Jews during their early history, and many of these ceremonies were in part adopted by them into their own religious rites. But we see that the Hebrew legislators were aware of the errors that spring from such superstitions. The sacrifices and sprinklings they enjoin are carefully explained to be simply a ceremonial. When the atonement is made in the case of a real crime of robbery or deceit, the priestly ceremony is to come after the restitution of the thing taken and not before it, or in any wise to stand in stead of it. Levit. vi. 1—7.

2. Has the Old Testament anything to say concerning REDEMPTION?

The theological phrase Redemption, or the buying mamkind out of the power and guilt of sin, has come down to us from the ancient Jews, who had gone through many grievous captivities and been sold into slavery under foreign masters. One of the characters under which they delighted to represent God is that of a deliverer who should redeem them out of their bondage. But the change of the figure by which Jesus is put into the place of redeemer, as it is God himself from whom we are to be redeemed, is foreign to any thought that is to be found in these writers. Far from standing coldly by, a stranger to his people's troubles, or asking for the blood of Christ as the price of their redemption, God is, in the Bible, represented as tenderly encouraging them and saying, "Fear not; I have redeemed thee, thou art mine."

3. What countenance does the Bible give to the doctrine of SUBSTITUTION?

In the superstitious rites of ancient nations the life of one animal was purchased by the substitution of another. Such an exchange might suit well with the dealings of barbarians, but to use these

Digitized by Google

methods of dealing with moral questions must destroy all clear ideas of rectitude. The older Hebrews scarcely rose out of the errors of those around them, and in the more ancient books of the Bible we find God spoken of as punishing the sins of men upon their descendants to the third and fourth generation. The priestly ceremony of sending out a scape goat into the desert, who should be supposed to bear away with him the unholiness of the people, is no doubt a relic of what had earlier been a real belief. But their writers set themselves earnestly to teach that our right and wrong conduct is personal, and that the blame and the penalty will rest upon ourselves. It would seem to be going back into barbarous times to teach that Jesus by his death or merits can in any way become a substitute for us, and save us from feeling the natural consequences of our fault.

(To be continued.)

THE LEVITICAL LAW.

To the Editor of the Unitarian Missionary.

Sir,—Your readers are probably all aware that modern criticism has fully proved that the body of Mosaic law contained in the Pentateuch—the first five books of the Bible—was not written till after the monarchy was established in Jerusalem. It was wholly unknown in the time of the Judges and Saul; and probably none of it came into existence until after the time of Solomon. Neither David nor Solomon acted in obedience to it in matters of religious ceremony—(2 Sam., 1 Kings.) Thus much may be considered settled, but it is not so easy to determine when each part of it was written. Critics are pretty well agreed that the larger part of Deuteronomy, say, at least chapters v.—xxv., was written in the reign of King Josiah, and was in fact the Book of the Law then found in the Temple (2 Kings xxii.) They are further, for the most part, agreed that the latter part of Leviticus, say chapters xviii.—xxvii., was written after the return from captivity. But latterly, some critics, among whom particularly may be mentioned Dr Kalisch and Bishop Colenso, have advanced the opinion that the Ceremonial Laws contained in the Books of Leviticus and Numbers were also written after the Captivity. It is against this opinion that I now propose to say a few words. I hold that the Levitical Law, claiming for the priests high powers over the rest of the Levites, was written at various times between the accession of King Jehoash and the death of King Hezekiah; that the time of their greatest power reached from the overthrow of the usurping Queen Athaliah and the bold deposition of King Uzziah as a leper (2 Chron. xxvi.), until the Assyrian invasion in Hezekiah's reign.

1. In its present form, including the introductory chapters i.—iv., Deuteronomy purports to be a recapitulation of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. But upon this we must not lay stress, because those introductory chapters may have been added afterwards. Its present name, also, which was given to it by the Greeks, gives us the same information; but this, perhaps, does not prove much.

2. Chapter v. 22, however, where we are told that Jehovah, after speaking the Ten Words, usually called the Ten Commandments, "added no more," distinctly points to the large additions in the Book of Exodus which follow upon the Commandments, namely, the Judgments and Statutes which this writer rejects, and replaces by new ones.

3. So when Deut. xii. 6 commands the people to bring to the appointed place the burnt-offerings, the sacrifices, the tithes, the heave-offerings, the vows, the freewill-offerings, and the firstlings, without any directions as to what these offerings are to be, we have a very clear reference to the Book of Leviticus, where all these offerings are explained at length. That portion of Leviticus, at least, was written before the end of Josiah's reign.

4. We read in 2 Chron. xxxi. that Hezekiah, when he appointed anew the courses of the priests and Levites, set Kore, a Levite, over the freewill-offerings, the heave-offerings, and the most holy things. Now, this was, of course, very unpopular with the priests, who called themselves Sons of Aaron; and we shall see that part of Numbers xvi. was then written in displeasure. In that chapter Korah, the Levite, is told by Moses, "Ye take too much upon yourselves, ye sons of Levi,—ye seek the priesthood also." The historic fact in the Book of Chronicles thus gives us a distinct date for the narrative in Numbers xvi.

5. Again, it will be observed that Numbers xvi. and xvii. were originally written to blame persons like Dathan and Abiram, who claimed to act as Levites; and Aaron's rod buds miraculously to prove the sacred rank of the tribe of Levi, not to prove the yet higher rank of the Aaronite priests. Hence, while we have gained a date for the narrative about Korah, we see that it had been inserted into a yet older narrative about Dathan and Abiram.

6. In 2 Chron. xxx. we read that King Hezekiah, not being ready with preparations for a

Digitized by Google

great celebration of the Passover by the full moon of the first month, took council with the priests, and celebrated it in the second month. And accordingly, to justify this ceremonial irregularity, we find a narrative in Numbers ix. 1—14, in which Moses allows certain men, who were not purified in time for the feast in the first month, to celebrate it in the second. As laws are usually made when the occasion calls for them; so this passage in Numbers was written to meet Hezekiah's difficulty.

7. The Books of Kings, which were put together in their present form in Ezra's time, usually tell us of each king, that he had not so far exerted his power on behalf of the priests of Jerusalem as to forbid all sacrifices at the High Places or altars throughout the country. Hezekiah however did so (2 Kings xviii. 4); and it was evidently to support this tyrannical wish that Leviticus was written, in which Jehovah orders all sacrifices to be brought to the one Tabernacle; and whoever did not do so was to be cut off from the people.

8. In Numbers xxi. 4—9 we have the Brazen Serpent mentioned without blame, and said to have been made by Moses. This was therefore certainly written before the reign of Hezekiah, who broke it to pieces as idolatrous, and was written probably in the reign of his father Ahaz, who seems to have set up that serpent in Jerusalem.

9. Thus far we have been comparing single passages in the Law with single passages in the History. But there remains the consideration of the broad question, When was the priesthood of Jerusalem most powerful, and therefore most likely to have dictated a code of laws for its own profit and importance? For this the reader must study the history of the Kings, and he will meet with a succession of struggles of the priests of Jerusalem, both against the Kings and "the people of the land." The people on their estates always wished to pay tribute to the overwhelming armies of Assyria and Babylon, rather than incur the misery of a fruitless resistance. The priestly governors within the walls of Jerusalem usually wished to resist. Hence arose a succession of violent revolutions which helped to bring the monarchy to ruin. Before the Assyrian invasions the priests of Jerusalem had governed the nation; but on the arrival of Sennacherib's army the country people would submit no longer. The great power of the priesthood ended with the Assyrian invasion. It was at the beginning of Hezekiah's reign that he closed the High Places, in order to please the priests of the capital and it was in the latter part of his reign that he promoted Kore, the Levite, to the great displeasure of those priests. The chief priest, as described in the Books of Leviticus and Numbers, agrees with what we find him in the history of the Kings, a very important person. But after the return from captivity his importance is very much less; indeed, the Book of Ezekiel makes no mention of such a person, although the latter chapters describe the temple, and its ordinances, when it was being rebuilt by Zerubabel.

10. Chapters i.—xv. of Leviticus contain, not a number of laws, each written as the occasion called for it, but rather a regular body of law, a ceremonial code; and hence a date can be given to it for the most part only by the general considerations last mentioned. But we have one event mentioned, the death of Nadab and Abihu in chapter x. which is again mentioned in Numbers iii. 4. This goes to prove that that portion of Leviticus is older than the Book of Numbers.

These facts seem to me quite enough, if not to prove, at least to make it probable, that the Ceremonial Laws in Leviticus and Numbers were written in the century and a half before the end of Hezekiah's reign.—Yours, &c.,

SAMUEL SHARPE.

THE TRUE THEOLOGY.

The two theologies at the present time which stand opposed to each other here are not Calvinism and Arminianism, not Trinitarianism and Unitarianism, not Naturalism and Supernaturalism. But they are the theology of discouragement and fear on the one side, and of courage and hope on the other. The one thinks men must be driven to God by terror; the other seeks to attract them by love. The one has no faith in man, believes him wholly evil, believes sin to be the essential part of him. The other believes reason a divine light in the soul, and encourages it to act freely; trusts in his conscience enlightened by truth, and appeals to it confidently; relies on his heart and seeks to inspire it with generous affections and disinterested love. That this theology of faith is to triumph over that of fear who can doubt? All the best thought, the deepest religion, the noblest aspiration of the age flows in this direction. Whether our handful of Unitarian churches is ever to become a great multitude I do not know; but I am sure that the spirit that inspired the soul of Channing is to lead the future age and make the churches which are to be. It is not now a question of Unity and Trinity, but something far deeper and more important. While endeavouring to settle the logical terms of Christ's divinity and humanity, we have been led up higher to the sight of the Divine Father and the human brotherhood. Like Saul, the son of Kish, we went out to seek our Father's asses, and have found a kingdom.—*James Freeman Clarke.*

PIETY AT HOME.

Religion is majestic in the state; it may be grand in the church,—in the church building a great institution, in the state swaying the destinies of millions of men. But piety looks lovelier and sweeter at home; not arrayed in her court dress, not set off in her church regimentals, but dressed in her homely week-day, work-day clothes. It is a little striking that the word piety, which rings so often in the Christian church, is mentioned only once in the English Bible, and then coupled with the admonition to show itself first at home.—*Theodore Parker.*

Digitized by Google

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

TWELFTH LESSON.

PRONOUNS.

A PRONOUN is used instead of a Noun; often to avoid the sound of repeating the same Noun in the same sentence.

We know how a little child only learns to use Pronouns after he is familiar with Nouns. He calls himself by his own name, and says Pa-pa, Ma-ma, long before he uses I, me, you, he; but we who have mastered Pronouns in our mother tongue shall presently, we hope, see that they are not difficult even in Greek.

Pronouns are divided into

Personal—	as	εγω, *I*,	συ, *thou*,	αυτος, *he*.
Possessive—	as	εμος, *my*,	σος, *thy*,	ὁς, *his*.
Demonstrative—	as		αυτος, *this*,	εκεινος, *that man*.
Indefinite—	as	τις, *any one*.		
Interogative—	as	τις, *who?*		
Relative—	as	ὁς, ἡ, ὁ, *who* or *which*,		
		and its compound ὁστις, *whosoever*.		

And some books make a few more than these.

Pronouns are declined, some like Nouns, with cases and numbers, as εγω, *I*, some like Adjectives, with cases, numbers, and genders also, as αυτος, *he*, both which we give below as samples :—

εγω, I.

Singular.		
N.	εγω,	I.
G.	εμου, μου,	of me.
D.	εμοι, μοι,	to me.
A.	εμε, με,	me.
Dual.		
N. A.	νωι, νῳ,	we two.
G. D.	νωιν, νῳν,	
Plural.		
N.	ἡμεις,	we.
G.	ἡμων,	of us.
D.	ἡμιν,	to us.
A.	ἡμας,	us.

αυτος, he, she, it, self.

	Mas.	Fem.	Neuter.
Singular.			
N.	αυτ-ος,	η	ο.
G.	αυτ-ου,	ης	ου.
D.	αυτ-ῳ,	ῃ	ῳ.
A.	αυτ-ον,	ην	ο.
Dual.			
N. A.	αυτ-ω	α	ω.
G. D.	αυτ-οιν	αιν	οιν.
Plural.			
N.	αυτ-οι	αι	α.
G.	αυτ-ων	ων	ων.
D.	αυτ-οις	αις	οις.
A.	αυτ-ους	ας	α.

Notice that the word εγω, *I*, is the same word in Greek as in Latin; and those who are fond of tracing all languages to one in the beginning, may notice also that our word *I*, and the German *Ich*, and the Italian *Io* are also all the same word a little altered.

James iii., 2—5.

1 Ει τις εν λογῳ ου πταιει, οὑτος τελειος ανηρ, δυνατος χαλιναγωγησαι
If any one in word not sinneth, this a perfect man, able to bridle

2 και ὁλον το σωμα· Ιδε, των ἱππων τους χαλινους εις τα στοματα
also the whole the body. Behold of the horses the bits into the mouths

3 βαλλομεν, προς το πειθεσθαι αυτους ἡμιν, και ὁλον το σωμα αυτων
we put, unto the to make obey them to us, and the whole the body of them

Digitized by Google

4	μεταγομεν.	Ιδου	και	τα	πλοια,	τηλικαυτα	οντα,	και	ὑπο	σκληρων ανεμων
	we turn about.	Behold	also	the	ships,	so great	being,	and	by	violent winds
5	ελαυνομενα,	μεταγεται	ὑπο	ελαχιστου	πηδαλιου,	ὁπου	αν	ἡ	ὁρμη	του
	being driven,	are turned	by	a very small	rudder,	where		the	skill	of the
6	ευθυνοντος	βουληται.	Οὑτω	και	ἡ	γλῶσσα	μικρον	μελος	εστι,	και
	steersman	may wish.	So	also	the	tongue	a little	member	is,	and
7	μεγαλαυχει.	Ιδου,	ολιγον	πυρ	ἡλικην	ὑλην	αναπτει.			
	greatly boasteth.	Behold	a little	fire	how great	a matter	it kindleth!			

We find constantly throughout the New Testament the Personal Pronoun is used in the Genitive Case instead of the Possessive Pronoun, thus, *μου, of me*, instead of, as in Classical Greek, *ἐμος, mu;* as on line 3, *αυτων, of them*, instead of *their*.

There is another difference from English to notice, and this is common to Classical and New Testament Greek, French, German, and Italian, and perhaps many other languages, that the Article is often used where we in English use the Possessive Pronoun, thus, *the hand* instead of *my hand;* as on line 2, *το σωμα, the body*, instead of, as we would say, *his body;* line 2, *τα στοματα, the mouths*, for *their mouths*.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

OUTLINE LESSON. SUBJECT—LOVE.

OBJECT—To teach that Love should be pure and disinterested, serving only the highest and noblest ends, and elevating and sanctifying all who are actuated by it.

TEXT

(To be written on the blackboard, or on slips of paper and distributed to the class.)

"Let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth."—1 John iii. 18.

Simplify the text, and draw its meaning from the children in their own words.

Scripture Lessons—(*a*) John xvi. 27; (*b*) Heb. xii. 6; (*c*) Gen. xxvii. 6 to 17; (*d*) 1 Sam. xviii. 1 to 3, xxiii. 15 to 17; (*e*) 2 Timothy i. 3 to 8, ii. 1 to 3.

(*a*) God's love shewn—1st, in the beauties and wonderful uses of Creation, the stars above, the grass and flowers beneath, the abundance of food provided for all living creatures, their means of enjoyment, &c., the changes of seasons, and alternations of day and night; 2nd, in his fatherly care and watchfulness over us His children, the sweet human affections which surround us, and the wonderful pleasure-giving powers of mind and body.

(*b*) God's love wise, not merely indulgent,—shewn as clearly in the trials and sorrows of life (because these tend to purify and ennoble the soul), as in its joys and pleasures.

We must strive to make our affections approach the Divine ideal. Mat. v. 43-48.

(*c*) Rebekah's love to Jacob ambitious, inducing her to counsel deceit and dishonesty. Was it in deed and in truth? What would be its effect on those influenced by it? Does it resemble God's love to us?

(*d*) Jonathan's affection for David pure and unselfish, entirely free from worldliness and jealousy; a beautiful type of the truest friendship, seeking the honour and happiness of another rather than its own.

(*e*) Paul's love for Timothy. Was it in deed and in truth? Why did Paul desire Timothy to be partaker of afflictions and to endure hardness? Is such a desire consistent with love? with the best and truest love, as having in view the highest and holiest aims.

The power of loving one another, given us by God, should be regarded as a sacred trust, to be used in His service alone, never under any circumstances to serve a low or unworthy end; and although it must be remembered that, "if a man love not his brother whom he hath seen," he cannot "love God whom he hath not seen," yet he cannot love his brother worthily and well unless he love God and goodness more.

FLORENCE GREGG.

Digitized by Google

NOTES OF PROGRESS.

LONDON.

Stepney Green.—On the 17th October there was a very interesting gathering on the occasion of the re-opening of the College Chapel, which has been purchased by the London District Unitarian Society. The chapel was filled with an Unitarian audience, who listened attentively to an eloquent discourse from the Rev. H. Ierson, in which he vindicated the Unitarian position as the true Christianity, divested of the accretions of so-called orthodoxy on the one hand, and filled with a spiritual life, and power, and reason that can withstand the shafts of the materialist or negationist on the other. After tea, served in the school gallery, a crowded meeting, presided over by S. Sharpe, Esq., was held, and various addresses were given by ministers and laymen. As shewing the drift of men and things, it is noteworthy that not only has the building passed through other hands, but that the speakers on the platform had been brought up in five different denominations in their youth, but are now throwing their labours into our cause. There was a general concurrence in the opinion that it was a favourable time for denominational effort. Mr Spears related that, at his first lecture in the neighbourhood he was not aware of the presence of a second Unitarian in the assembly, and a warm discussion ensued. About five years ago regular worship was established in a room in a private house; and notwithstanding the discouragement of having at times to meet in miserable places, and of other depressing circumstances, the friends here have manfully persevered, and under their present minister, the Rev. E. R. Grant, they are steadily increasing in numbers, and gathering in a good Sunday School, their prospects are quite encouraging.

The Wednesday evening conferences in Stamford Street are attracting attention to religious problems.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

On Some of the Points of Contact between Religion and Sociology: A Sermon, preached in the Treville Street Chapel, Plymouth, during the Congress of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, Sept. 15, 1872. By T. W. Freckelton. London: E. T. Whitfield, 178 Strand.

The aim of this discourse is to shew the true character and nature of Religion, and its influence upon society. The author well defines what religion is when he says—"Religion . . . . . is the exercise of justice, sympathy, charity, in the high and wide sense, and philanthropy or benevolence, inclusive of real help." Every true man will agree with this definition of religion, though it is somewhat different from that set forth in orthodox creeds.

The time has now arrived when men, if they would be true to their natures, must say hard things, though these may run counter to the creeds of their forefathers. Emerson, in his essay on Self-Reliance, says:—"Speak what you think now in hard words, and to-morrow speak what to-morrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict everything you said to-day." All who make the above their motto will peruse with pleasure this effort of Mr Freckelton.

C. D.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS AND FRIENDS.

We desire to say a word to our subscribers and friends at the close of our first volume. We have so far carried on our paper with the view with which we set out—not to compete with existing periodicals of the Unitarian body, but—that it might fill a place which our experience in active missionary work has taught us was not occupied. For the future we think we shall be able to do our work more effectually. If our friends will help us, we will endeavour to make it possible for the poorest person to obtain Unitarian information. We cannot do this, unless we are aided—without loss. The aid we suggest is, that every Unitarian, if not on his own account, then on account of thousands of our fellow-creatures, whose lives have not been brightened with the cheerful faith and glorious hope which Unitarians have enjoyed, should take at least a copy, and give it to some person, who, perhaps, will be glad to receive it. We think we might easily get double our present number of subscribers if such help could be afforded us.

We trust that the friends who read this will see that a means is here offered for doing some service to our day and generation. It is well known that there are not missionaries enough to do the work which Unitarians might attempt. A periodical, giving Unitarian information, in some measure supplies the want.

TO OUR AGENTS.

We owe a word of thanks to the kind friends in various towns who have kindly taken the trouble to supply the *Missionary*. We trust they will continue to afford us their valuable aid.

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

No. 1. [New Series.] JANUARY 1873. Price 1d.

UNITARIAN PROGRESS IN SCOTLAND.

WE use the term Unitarian more as a name for a class of ideas of religion than as the title of a sect or party. What might be termed organised Unitarianism in Scotland, is, truly, very small in extent compared with Presbyterianism. For a long time certain liberal ideas were held by those only who very firmly maintained their belief in the simple Unity of God, and the trust-worthiness of man's reason and conscience. Possibly a man might be a Unitarian so far as belief in the Unity of God goes, and yet fail to reach the position which was held by Channing, and in the present day is shared by the Rev. James Martineau and Dr Beard. A Unitarian church is different from all other churches in this respect: its worship and practice are based upon the principle that in all matters of opinion there is a possibility of difference, and that the only sure ground of union for men as spiritual beings meeting together to worship God and commune with each other is affection. Congregations which were left free to change the nature of their theology from time to time have, in many instances, come to the position which may be found in the writings of the above-named individuals.

Scotland, for many generations, has been the home of a very strong Calvinism, every effort being made to prevent the drifting away of ministers and congregations from the Shorter Catechism and the Confession of Faith. Any person venturing to openly utter opinions opposed to the doctrines of the Standards was liable to be expelled from the Church. The union of Presbyterians has been a legal one. The fulfilling of certain conditions gives a right to sit at the Lord's table, and to a place on the church roll. The management of the Presbyterian churches in Scotland reminds one of Parliament and the Law Courts. The consistent Presbyterian is a Calvinist, and there are many such. At this moment, however, it is impossible to say that every Presbyterian is a Calvinist. We are told by members of orthodox churches that in some pulpits the doctrines of Calvinism are never preached. Instead of discussions about the Trinity, men are told to worship the Father in spirit and in truth. And although the doctrine of Endless Torments is not directly denied, yet the unbounded love of God is proclaimed without qualification. The doctrine of the Atonement, which makes it only possible for God to be gracious to His children after a substitute has borne the penalty of their sins, is neglected, and the beautiful lesson of the Parable of

Digitized by Google

the Prodigal Son is taught instead. In their freedom Unitarians have adopted certain ideas, and every one of these may be detected in the published sermons and speeches of orthodox men. Not all by one man: but here is one who denies the dogma of Hell; there one who regards the doctrine of the Trinity as a speculation; there another who affirms the natural dignity of the human race. As these ideas have, to some extent, become identified with those who hold the position termed Unitarian, their progress is the progress of Unitarian sentiments in Scotland. It is reported that there are in Dundee several ministers who are liberal; some of them having a wide reputation. One has boldly broken down the barrier between his Church and the Unitarian Church, by holding fellowship with Mr Martineau.

All this is encouraging to Unitarians, for having for years labored to overthrow the iron rule of Creeds, that natural religion might be promoted; they now see others coming to the light. But these are bound by the most solemn bonds not to adopt other ideas of religion. If a Unitarian seeks admission to an orthodox church as a Unitarian he is refused, but he may take a seat and hear Unitarian sentiments proclaimed. The apparent violation of moral law is the offence which gives occasion for reproach towards the Broad-Church party in Scotland.

The parish minister of Dundee, Dr Watson, according to the *Advertiser*, at a social gathering of a Congregational Church, gave a speech which "was characterised by a broad, liberal, and tolerant spirit. He thought "the misunderstandings between the various sects had much in common "with the difficulties which the old pre-Copernican astronomers had in "explaining the motions of the planets. The error of the old astronomers "lay in supposing the earth to be the centre of the universe, instead of "being merely a subordinate planet like the others. In like manner each "sect was too much given to suppose that they were alone stable, for-"getting that, like their fellow-Christians, they were revolving round the "grand centre of all, although in a different orbit." Theodore Parker would have seen breadth and truth in such sentiments.

We cannot in our space detail all the signs of progress. Our readers must take our word that there is a marked advance manifested in many quarters in Scotland towards Unitarian ideas.

CONSCIENCE A REVEALER.

OF all subjects of human thought, none can be more important, none can be more full of anxious and absorbing interest, than this one,—"What are GOD'S present dispositions towards His human family? What are His purposes regarding them for time, and for eternity?" He is infinite in power; there is no might "in heaven above, or on the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth;" there is no potency, either in the counsels of angels, or in the firmest wills and oppositions of men, that can effectually resist His dominion, or successfully oppose His designs; so that (as far as mere ability is concerned) He can raise us for ever to inconceivable joy, or plunge us for ever into unspeakable woe, with none to say unto Him, "What doest Thou?" Holding, not only our temporal fates, but our eternal destinies, thus completely in His own soveregn hand, it is surely a question above all other questions,

Digitized by Google

"What are the feelings He entertains towards us now; and what are His intentions respecting us in the dim and unexplored futurity of our existence?" in a single phrase, "What is the MORAL CHARACTER of GOD?" Where shall we find this knowledge? Nowhere so readily, and nowhere so fully, as in the *Human Conscience.*

In the very nature of things, we should expect this to be the case. Who made the Conscience? Who lodged it in the soul of man. Who taught it to descern between right and wrong? Who taught it to urge its possessor to strive after the one, and to flee from the other? Who taught it to punish us with remorse when we disobeyd its injunctions, and to reward us with a sweet inward satisfaction when we were faithful to its monitions? None, obviously, but the CREATOR Himself. Conscience is literally, and almost without any figure of speech, a portion of the Godhead incarnated in every child of Adam; is one of the perfections of the Supreme enshrined in every heir of mortality. Hence it follows that the commands of conscience are the commands of GOD; that the prohibitions of conscience are the prohibitions of GOD; that the censures of conscience are the censures of GOD; that the approbations of conscience are the approbations of GOD; in a single phrase, that the Voice of Conscience is the VOICE of GOD, ever sounding solemnly through the deep caverns of the human soul.

Now, what are some of the dispositions which conscience forces us to condemn when manifested by any of our fellow-creatures? Cruelty, injustice, revenge, inexorableness, partiality, capriciousness, punishing the innocent instead of the guilty; nay, punishing even the guilty themselves with a severity disproportioned to their trangressions, to the amount of their moral light, to the force of their temptations, to their powers of resistance. As God is the author of conscience, it is evident that He can never manifest, that HE can never possess dispositions in Himself which He has taught this conscience so loudly and earnestly to *condemn* when displayed by human beings. What, again, are some of the dispositions which conscience forces us to approve and to praise, when manifested by any of our fellow-men? Righteousness, equity, benevolence, compassion, mercy, a desire of securing the welfare, the happiness of all, even of the wicked, not excluding them from the outflow of our affection. As GOD is the author of conscience, it is plain then He must be in full and boundless possession of the qualities and excellencies which He has commissioned it to crown with its reverence and applause; in other words, that HE must possess, as the very essence of His nature, that He must exhibit, in His government of man during time, and no less in His government of man throughout eternity, *infinite* righteousness, *infinite* equity, *infinite* benevolence, *infinite* compassion, and *infinite* mercy. Thus is the Human Conscience a Revealer of the Moral Character of God; and under the rule of a Being possessed of the perfections it assigns to Him, the destinies, both of our individual selves and of our entire race, are safe (oh! how safe!) not only for this life, but for that which is to come!

R. E. B. MACLELLAN.

IT is needful that a man be true; not that he live. Are men dogs that they must be happy? Luther dared to be undone.—*Theodore Parker.*

GREATER is he who is above temptation than he who, being tempted, overcomes. —*A. Bronson Alcott.*

Digitized by Google

BROAD CHURCH IMMORALITY.

THERE are many passages in the Bible which describe with approval actions which we think most wicked. The Israelites commit cruel murders, are guilty of falsehoods, and particularly of robbing the foreigners; and these things are described as innocent, and are often said to be done in obedience to the commands of God. The writers show a sad ignorance of right and wrong, accompanied with a strong religious earnestness. While we read such passages, we may admire the religious earnestness though we regret that the conscience was not more enlightened. Countless as are these wicked acts spoken of without blame, yet there is perhaps only one single passage in which any countenance is given to a man's acting against his own judgment, against the commands of his own conscience. This is in the case of Naaman the Syrian, described in 2 Kings v. Naaman was an officer high in the service of the Syrian King. Among the Israelites he was converted to the worship of Jehovah, and hence arose the difficulty. What is he to do when he returns home? May he, as before, accompany the King his master into the Temple of Rimmon, and worship, or pretend to worship the idol? He asks the advice of the prophet Elisha, who gives him permission to do so, saying, "Go in peace." We need not suppose that this is a true story. It was written several centuries after the time mentioned when Nehemiah was governor of Jerusalem, and it gains its importance from that circumstance. Nehemiah had been brought up in the palace and in the service of the King of Persia. He was an especial favourite with his master; and when grieving for the distresses of his countrymen in Jerusalem, he obtains leave from the Persian King to go there, and to help them to rebuild the city. This he does with the pious zeal of a true Jew. But he had only obtained leave of absence for a limited time. At the end of that time the good Nehemiah returns to Persia, and to his duties as cupbearer to the King, which seem to have included the accompanying him when he worshipped in his Temple. Nehemiah must have felt the difficulty of his position; and then it would seem that some friendly hand wrote this story of Naaman the Syrian to apologise for Nehemiah's compliance with the Persian religious customs. We who are not under the same temptation must not be severe upon Nehemiah, but at the same time we must not justify his conduct. The liberal clergymen, the Broad-Churchmen of our present day, are in the same position. They are violating their consciences, and are worshipping in the Temple of Rimmon. Let us be sorry for them. Let us wish them strength of character to act properly in their trying circumstances, and to come out as honest men.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE ATONEMENT DOCTRINES.

4. What does the Old Testament say concerning PROPITIATION?

The Bible writers unceasingly labour to impress upon us that all wrongdoing is an offence against God. They threaten us with his wrath if we do amiss, and warn us that we must make haste to avert or to escape it. Among those nations who dreaded God, sacrifices seem to have been chiefly

Digitized by Google

considered as a means of appeasing anger. We meet with sacrifices of this sort in Homer, and the burning of incense and sacrifices of a sweet savour among the Jews may have had this for their origin. But the graver writers among them earnestly endeavour to keep us out of the error of supposing that there is any such use in these ceremonies. They assure us that the sacrifices God will accept are a contrite and obedient heart. These, and these only, he delights in. What need have we then to look to foreign atonements in order to procure for ourselves that favour and forgiveness our heavenly Father is only too ready to give us?

5. Does the Bible give us anything like the doctrine of SATISFACTION?

The doctrine of satisfaction seems to rest upon the natural instincts that rise up within us when we have done wrong. Our sense of responsibility presses heavily upon us. We feel that though God should forgive us, and all the world should have forgotten our fault, there is something within us that can neither forgive nor forget, and will not be put aside. This something modern writers on the Atonement theory call *justice*. The majesty of justice, they say, has been outraged, and God himself is not at liberty to set its claims at nought, but is bound, before he pardons us, to see the penalty exacted and a satisfaction made. Now this is not the language of he Bible, for the reason that the devout temper of the Hebrew poeple would not allow them to separate God and justice, or to represent them as having different interests. Their writers and teachers are chiefly busied in impressing upon us the thought that our sins are an offence against God; but these other feelings of conscience are not altogether overlooked by them. The parable of the prodigal son is one of the most complete explanations of the doctrines of God's forgiveness that the Bible contains, and we see here that the penitent, though taken back into his father's affection, is not placed where he stood before. As remarked by Mr Freeman Clarke, in his "Christian Doctrine of the Forgiveness of Sin," the prodigal's patrimony is wasted; there is no new division of the estate. From the early prophets down to Jesus and the Apostles we are not encouraged to hope that "Satisfaction" can be made for our faults otherwise than by humble and patient up-hill work, nor are we suffered to look for any outward means save the help that God himself is always ready to give to those who come to him for strength in their earnest efforts.

BROKEN LIGHTS.

IN the Introduction to "In Memoriam" we are told by the poet-laureate

> "Our little systems have their day;
> They have their day and cease to be:
> They are but broken lights of thee,
> And thou, O Lord, art more than they."

In these lines we have a truth stated which should be impressed on every mind. There are persons who are unwilling, or persistently refuse to believe it possible that the systems of belief to which they hold shall pass away. But all history goes to show their position an unreasonable one. In the order of providence forms of faith "have their day," and are superseded by others better adapted to the advancing culture of men. From the lowest forms of religion up to monotheism there was a gradual and continuous process of change, the inferior conceptions giving place to

Digitized by Google

higher. Jewish theology was not just the same thing at the advent of Jesus that it was in the time of Moses. And throughout Christian times change has been constant. Attempts have been made to give permanency to certain doctrines by embodying them in creeds enforced by state power; but what one council ordered to be received as true, other councils took the liberty of altering or setting aside. The light of one generation, though deemed whole and perfect, generally proved a "broken" one to succeeding generations; and failing to give enduring satisfaction fuller light had to be sought for.

And this constant change in the beliefs of men is a matter from which there is much to be learnt. It shows that those who are dogmatic and uncharitable make a serious mistake. They confound their individual apprehensions of truth with truth itself. Against such an error every one should be on his guard. Our forms of faith are of great value and importance as the expression of our religious thought and sentiment. But it is unpardonable to regard them as full and final embodiments of religious truth. Doubtless there is fuller light to be obtained yet in religion as well as in all other matters. There is no reason to think the process of change, which has been in operation until now, will not continue in the future, but every reason for thinking it will. And the evident duty of each one is, therefore, to be open-minded and charitable. There should be fidelity to the opinions already held, and a persistent endeavour to gain whatever further knowledge and light may be obtained. When a fresh truth presents itself it should be made welcome. It should find a ready entrance into the mind, and be allowed to modify existing opinions as the case may demand. And at the same time every one should be charitable in his conduct towards those who differ from him in opinion. When opinions are so liable to change—are at best but "broken lights," it ill becomes any one to exhibit a dogmatic spirit. No one system is altogether true or altogether false—each one is but a stepping-stone to something better; and for this reason all intolerance or harsh treatment of others on account of speculative differences is condemned. The great object for a man to keep before him is to love the truth and to honestly strive to gain possession of it. That is what he is responsible for—not for the actual possession of truth. This is the light in which each man's responsibility should be viewed; and when this is done there will be a happier day for the Church of Christ.

J. G. S.

DR KALISCH ON THE LEVITICAL LAW.

To the Editor of the Unitarian Missionary.

Sir,—The respect due to Mr Samuel Sharpe must plead my apology for troubling you with a few observations on the above subject, in reply to the arguments brought forward by him in the letter which appeared in your last impression. The reader will remember that the point at issue is this:—Were the Ceremonial Laws, embodied in the middle Books of the Pentateuch, compiled after the Captivity, or were they, as Mr Sharpe maintains, chiefly "written in the century and a half before the end of "Hezekiah's reign"? The question is of no ordinary importance and interest: for are we, in accordance with the latter view, to suppose that the narrow and hierarchical spirit of the ninth and eighth centuries was, in the seventh, conquered by those large and prophetic conceptions which pervade Deuteronomy? or does, on the contrary,

Digitized by Google

the tenour of Hebrew history point to a gradual and steady advance from prophetism to levitism? The subject, thoroughly entwined as it is both with the political and the religious annals of the nation, is so vast and intricate that the merest outlines only can be attempted in this place; and I believe I can hardly do better than follow Mr Sharpe step by step, and examine the weight and value of his arguments.

But, at the outset, I cannot avoid expressing my surprise that so acute and honest a critic should use the Books of Chronicles as reliable historical sources, and found upon them some of his principal conclusions. He is well aware that these Books, probably not of earlier date than the Macedonian period, were compiled with the object of glorifying the priestly order; that they disagree with the older and more impartial documents in numberless statements; and that they are valuable only in so far as they reflect the ecclesiastical tendencies of their own time. And yet Mr Sharpe attaches implicit faith to the Chronist's story respecting the deposition of the leprous King Uzziah on account of an alleged usurpation of sacredotal functions, of which the Books of Kings make no mention whatever; and on the sole strength of this legend, the bias of which is transparent, he avers that the priesthood was at no time more powerful than in the age of Uzziah. But in reviewing his remarks singly, we shall meet with other and even stranger deductions based on the same untenable premises.

1. "Deuteronomy purports to be a recapitulation of Exodus, Leviticus, and Num-"bers." Indeed? From its nature, a recapitulation must satisfy two conditions: it must reproduce the chief points of the subject; and it must strictly harmonise with the more detailed accounts. Now, in both respects, Deuteronomy, if compared with the three preceding Books, is entirely at fault: it is silent on some of the most essential institutions appointed in the middle Books, such as the Expiatory Sacrifices, the Day of Atonement, and the Year of Jubilee; and in some other important ordinances it is strikingly at variance with these Books, as for instance, in the laws of the first-born, the tithes, and the priestly revenues in general. Therefore, Deuteronomy is *not* a recapitulation of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, and is, hence, not necessarily of later date than these Books.

2. In his next argument Mr Sharpe refers us to Deuteronomy v. 22: now what does he find in this passage? simply this, that "Jehovah, after speaking the Ten "Commandments, 'added no more;'" and what does he infer from the statement? neither more nor less than that it "points to the large additions in the Book of Exo-"dus which there follow upon the Commandments, namely the Judgments and Sta-"tutes which the writer rejects, and replaces by new ones." It would be difficult to say whether the reading of the Biblical text, or the inference drawn from it, is more extraordinary. The verse quoted runs thus:—"These words the Lord spoke "to all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire." . . "And He "added no more." The chief stress, as every one must see, lies on the words "to all "your assembly:" the Ten Commandments were the only words which God addressed directly to the whole congregation of Israel; for the people, dreading such immediate communion with God, exclaimed, "If we hear the voice of the Lord our "God any more, then we shall die." But did God really "add no more"? The narrative in Deuteronomy distinctly declares the contrary; for the elders said to Moses, "Go thou near, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say, and speak thou "to us all that the Lord our God shall speak to thee." And so it happened: God, approving of the people's request, ordered them to return into their tents, whilst he said to Moses, "But thou stand here by me, and I will speak to thee all the com-"mandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which thou shalt teach them" (verse 31.) Do these words leave a doubt? Do they imply that the writer rejected any previous judgments and statutes, and replaced them by new ones?

But let us not lose sight of the cardinal point of the controversy: the reference to "the additions which, in the Book of Exodus, follow upon the Commandments," is altogether irrelevant to our subject; for the "Book of the Covenant" (Exod. xx. 19 to xxiii. 33), which nearly all critics admit to be older than Deuteronomy, does not treat of the "Levitical Law" at all; it hardly contains a single ceremonial precept; and the moral, social, and penal laws which it enacts agree, in most instances, with the corresponding injunctions in Deuteronomy.

It is not wisely acted in the interest of a science which is to re-conquer our religious and intellectual freedom, first to obscure a text by imperfect quotation, and then to apply it to subjects with which it has no connection.

To be concluded in our next.

Digitized by Google

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

OUTLINE LESSONS ON JOHN THE BAPTIST.

No. I.—HIS CHARACTER.

OBJECT—To show that only by loving obedience to God and His laws can we be fitted to carry out the work appointed for us.

TEXT—"With good-will doing service as to the Lord, and not to man."—Eph. vi. 7.

Scripture Readings—(a) Matt. iii. 1 to 4; *(b)* 11 to 12; *(c)* 13 to 14; *(d)* Mark vi. 16 to 20.

Begin with an account of the condition of the Jewish people at this time, their subjection to the Roman yoke, their religion sunk into a state of indifference and ceremonialism; the raising up of John the Baptist just when he was most needed. Note, that it is oftentimes not the wealthy or the mighty whom God chooses to carry out his greatest works; that the workers themselves seldom know what their mission is until the full time has come; and then they find how, by implicit obedience and steady faithfulness in small things, they have been learning to perform this greater and nobler work.

(a) What do we learn of the character of John from his dress and manner of living? Refer to Matt. vi. 25.

(b) His self-renunciation; caring nothing for his own honor and advancement, while his mind is filled with the greatness of his work; seeking not to attach disciples to himself, but rather to direct them to higher and holier aims.

(c) His humility.

(d) What does this narrative show? 1st, uprightness, causing Herod to be ashamed before him, to feel his own guilt more acutely, and even to fear the brave, pure, truthful man. 2nd, courage, boldly to speak the truth and rebuke error. 3rd, resignation to the will of God and devotion to His service, preferring rather to die in the cause of truth and righteousness, than by unfaithfulness to prolong his life.

Could such a character be produced all at once, or would it not rather have been forming during the thirty years spent by John with his old parents in his quiet country home? Would it not have been by habitual temperance, loving obedience, truthfulness in all things to himself and others, the resistance of small temptations and courageous opposition to everything dishonorable or mean? Let us then learn to be faithful in the least, that we may be ready when called upon to be faithful also in much: to obey the will of God in the smallest things that we may be fitted to serve Him in the greatest.

FLORENCE GREGG.

WHY WE ARE DISSENTERS.

A LETTER TO THE YOUNG.

MY dear children,—I do not know whether you know, but I think you are old enough to know, what a great privilege you enjoy in being brought up as Dissenters.

A Dissenter is one who thinks for himself in matters of religion; a

Digitized by Google

Churchman had his form of religion settled for him by an Act of Parliament that was passed in the reign of Charles II., about two hundred years ago.

A long while before that, every one in England was Roman Catholic, and the Pope told them all what they must believe, and what they must not believe; above all, they must be quite sure that he was always right.

At last some people began to think for themselves, which made the Pope very angry, and he excommunicated them. These people were called Protestants, because they protested against the Pope.

Well, when people begin to think for themselves, each one is likely to think differently from his neighbour. People had been so used to all believing alike, and all believing by rule, that they were quite frightened, and began to wonder what would become of it all. So they said, "Let us make a rule about what we are all to believe. It shall not be a foolish rule like the Pope's; it shall be a good rule." Everybody was quite willing, but the difficulty was to find something that everybody thought a good rule, when so many people thought differently. At last a good many of those who had most power met, and made a string of rules, which they called "The Thirty-Nine Articles," and got an Act of Parliament to say that it was right. They agreed that they were the true Church, and they told all the others that they must belong to it; and they called it the Church of England, and they said "the Church is always right;" though nobody knows quite what "the Church" is.

However, the others did not agree, they did not like to have their religion settled for them by Act of Parliament. They wished to settle it for themselves. These people were called Dissenters, because they dissented or differed from the Church.

The Church people told them they would be sure to go to hell when they died. They did not quite try to take away all their goods from them, but they took the Churches for themselves, and a good deal of money. This was wrong to do, because it was unjust, but I don't know that it did the Dissenters much harm, for, fortunately, the Church people have no more power than the Pope to settle who will go to hell; and as to the money—those who have had least money often have had most zeal; and zeal is a much better thing than money to my thinking.

By that time, as you see, the Catholics had had it settled for them what they were to believe, and the Church of England had settled for themselves what they must believe, and the Dissenters were left free to think as they pleased. The consequence of this was, that they thought so many different things, that some among them got frightened, and said, "we must make a rule, and tell people what they must believe." They tried, but they did not succeed in getting all to agree, so they divided into different sects, and each sect had a rule for itself. They put these rules into the trust-deeds of their chapels, and they make their ministers say that they believe these rules. You must ask your father what a trust-deed is.

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

THIRTEENTH LESSON.

PARSING.

WE begin the new year with setting our diligent and persevering pupils a task, namely, to take any chapter they may choose out of the Greek Testament and parse it in the way we show below.

Digitized by Google

Sample Lesson in Parsing.—Hebrews ii. 6.

Greek.	English.	Parts of Speech	Parsing.	Word as in Dictionary.	Reasons and Agreements.
τι	What [thing]	Pron.	Nom. sing. neuter	τις, τι	Agreeing with the nom. *thing* understood.
εστιν	is	Verb	3rd p. sing, pres. indic.	ειμι, εσομαι	Agreeing with its nominative *thing*.
ανθρωπος	man	Noun	Nom. sing. masculine	ανθρωπος, ου, 2	The nom. after the substantive verb εστιν.
ὅτι	that	Conj.			
μιμνησκῃ	thou art mindful	Verb	2 sing. pres. ind. mid.	μιμνησκω, μνησω	Agrees with its nom. *thou* understood.
αυτου ;	of him ?	Pron.	Genitive, sing. mas.	αυτος, η, ο	Gen. because μιμνησκῃ requires Gen. after it.
η	or	Conj.			
υἱος	a son	Noun	Nom. sing. mas.	υἱος, ου, 2	Nom. after εστιν, because joined by η, *or*.
ανθρωπου	of man	Noun	Gen. sing. mas.	ανθρωπος, ου, 2	Gen. because 2nd of two nouns is usually Gen.
ὅτι	that	Conj.			
επισκεπτῃ	thou considerest	Verb	2 sing. pres. ind. mid.	επισκεπτω, ψω.	Agrees with its nom. *thou* understood.
αυτον ;	him ?	Pron.	Accusa. sing. mas.	αυτος, η, ο	Acc. because επισκεπτῃ governs the Acc.
Ηλαττωσας	Thou madest less	Verb	2 sing. 1 Aor. ind. act.	ελαττοω, ωσω	Agrees with its nom. *thou* understood.
αυτον	him	Pron.	Acc. sing. masculine	αυτος, η, ο	Acc. because ηλαττωσας governs the Acc.
βραχυ	a little	Adj.	} Act. sing. neuter	βραχυς, εια, υ.	} Agreeing with *thing* understood
τι	some[what]	Pron.		τις, τι	
παρ'	in comparison with	Prep.	Governing the accusa.		
αγγελους·	angels ;	Noun	Acc. plural mas.	αγγελος, ου, 2	Governed by the preposition παρα.
δοξῃ	with glory	Noun	Dat. sing. fem.	δοξα, ης, 1	Dat. govd. by the prep. εν, *with* understood.
και	and	Conj.			
τιμῃ	with honour	Noun	Dat. sing. fem.	τιμη, ης, 1	Governed by same εν, because joined by και.
εστεφανωσας	thou crownedst	Verb	2 sing. 1 Aor. ind. act.	στεφανοω, ωσω	Agreeing with its nom. *thou* understood.
αυτον.	him.	Pron.	Acc. sing. mas.	αυτος, η, ο	Acc. governed by εστεφανωσας.

Digitized by Google

Remark that τι when it asks a question is *what* [*thing*]; and when it does not ask a question is *some* [*thing.*] Also, that the two Verbs in the 1 Aorist Tense begin with an Augment, which, when we look at the Present Tense in the *Dictionary* column, we find is not there.

Our pupils must remember, in filling the column headed *Dictionary*, to put the Present and Future Tenses of Verbs; the Nominative Case, with the ending of the Genitive of Nouns; and to give, with Pronouns, Adjectives, Participles, and Articles the endings of their three Genders.

LINES WRITTEN UPON THE FLY LEAF OF A GREEK GRAMMAR BY A PUPIL OF A CLASS.

Greek is, 'tis said, the language of the Immortals;
And so, when I emerge through death's dark portals
Into the better land, where ancient Homer,
No longer sightless, and no more a roamer,
Sits singing to the myriads who attend:
May I be able too, to comprehend. W. H. C.

Islington, Dec. 1872.

NOTES OF PROGRESS.

SCOTLAND.

DUNFERMLINE.—The congregation of Unitarian Universalists, who have been under the ministry of the Rev. R. S. Bowie, assembled for their annual soiree on the 9th ult., in their new meeting-place, Pilmuir Street. There was a good attendance. Addresses were given by the Revs. R. S. Bowie, Alex. Webster, and H. Williamson.

AUCHTERMUCHTY.—The Editor of *The Missionary* gave a Unitarian lecture on the 10th ult., this being the first attempt in that place. There were about sixty persons present, who were apparently interested in the address and the replies to questions. Further efforts will probably be made in this locality.

On a recent visit to PERTH, we learned that some of our friends there are feeling the want of a religious service, and possibly they may make an application for aid in resuming Unitarian worship in that city before long.

IRELAND.

BELFAST.—It is interesting to note that our churches here seem to be full of life and vigour. A short time since a meeting was held to provide additional sitting accommodation for the members of the first congregation (Rev. J. Scott Porter.) The York Street Church (Rev. J. Jellie's) is not adequate to the wants of the congregation, and some steps will probably be taken to increase the sittings. Two new societies have been formed lately, both having for their object the moral and intellectual improvement of their members. One is connected with the second congregation, and has for its president the Rev. Jas. C. Street. The society will hold its meetings in the new lecture hall, which stands close to the church, and will be an important addition to our institutions. The scheme of the promoters embraces the establishment of a reading room, to be supplied with undenominational papers and magazines, a class for the discussion of questions of interest, and social meetings to promote fellowship and acquaintance among the members. Three meetings have been already held in the vestry of the church. At the first meeting, the question, "Is war justifiable?" was discussed. At the second meeting, Mr E. A. Fuhr read an interesting paper on the Education question. The President spoke in support of the position that education should be free, secular, and compulsory. At the next meeting, Mr Robert Sharp read a paper on "The Second Reforma-

Digitized by Google

tion." The second society is called the York Street Non-Subscribing Mutual Improvement Class, and its meetings are held weekly. The attendance numbers upwards of one hundred. The Rev. J. Jellie is engaged giving sketches of the Faiths of the World, which are interesting and instructive. Papers have been read on the following subjects:—"Education," "Ancient Rome," "The Theology of the Early Church," "Woman's Work," "Reformatories," "Hints to Young Housekeepers." Recitations and readings diversify the proceedings. Such societies, when wisely conducted, are calculated to do much good, and they ought to be encouraged. We lose young people frequently by neglecting to provide suitable means for drawing them together in the church or schoolroom. We have never been able to understand why our churches have not been turned to better account during the week. A new school and lecture hall will ere long be erected at Mount Pottinger, a populous district, by Dr Ritchie, J.P., and it is not improbable that a mission station will be established there.

Ballymena.—The Rev. Halliwell Thomas, late of Bridport, has been appointed minister here. The town is one of the most prosperous in the north of Ireland, but, owing to various circumstances, our cause has not prospered. For some time there was no settled minister, and it seemed likely that the property would be sold. Through the exertions of the Belfast Unitarian Society, of late the pulpit was regularly supplied. Now that there is a settled minister, it is to be hoped the cause will be revived.

Carrickfergus.—The Rev. Arthur Peaton has been engaged in delivering a course of doctrinal lectures. The attendance, on the whole, has been satisfactory.

Downpatrick.—Lectures are now being delivered here by the Rev. David Gordon, and some of the neighbouring ministers. The first lecture was given by the Rev. J. Scott Porter, of Belfast, on "St Patrick." The church was crowded to inconvenience on the occasion.

Monyrea.—For the first time the experiment of a course of evening lectures was tried here last season. The result justifies a fresh effort. The lectures were on the following subjects:—"God," "Christ," "Man," "The Bible," "Salvation," and "Immortality."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Modern Pulpit, Nos. 1, 2, 3: By Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D. London, Smart & Allan, London House Yard, Paternoster Row.

Dr Beard has been long and widely known and respected as one of the most zealous and successful of our educational leaders. The energies of his life have been devoted to the great work of education; and he has ever been anxious to bring the blessings of education within reach of the humblest classes in the community. Deeply impressed with the conviction that education must have a religious basis, and that home is the place where, naturally, it must begin and be carried forward, Dr Beard is now issuing a series of discourses, at a merely nominal charge, to aid the cause of enlightened and true religion. The titles of the sermons before are—us "The Education of the People, by and for the People," "Gregory XIII. and the Massacre of St Bartholmnew," "The True Jubilee, or the Growth, Spread, and Permanent Influence of the Religion of Jesus." We have pleasure in directing attention to these discourses, which deserve to be attentively read and widely circulated.

The Person of Christ: A Lecture: By the Rev. W. Gaskell, M.A. London, H. Brace, 178 Strand; Manchester, Johnson & Rawson, 87 Market St.

This is a reprint of a lecture published several years ago. We have read it with much satisfaction and profit. The style is clear, simple, and concise, yet pointed and vigorous. Every Unitarian who reads it will be strengthened in his convictions, and rejoiced that his views have been so admirably set forth; while every Trinitarian into whose hands the lecture may fall will find how powerfully scripture, reason, and common sense plead on our behalf. This excellent lecture should be circulated as widely as possible.

Digitized by Google

THE

Unitarian Missionary.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

No. 2. [New Series.] FEBRUARY 1873. Price 1d.

WHO ARE THE HERETICS?

HAVING, in a former number of this journal, asked and answered the question—"To whom should be applied the name of Sceptics?" we may also find it worth our while to look into the origin and meaning of the words Heretic and Heresy, which have been applied so often by one set of religionists with such terrible force and consequences to others of a different faith. Perhaps the name of Sceptic may be said to entail upon those to whom it is usually given only a little opprobrium, so as to act, at the worst, as a sort of social ban or sentence of excommunication; but in the case of imputed heresy, we know that for many centuries it served as an apology and pretext for frightful persecutions, by which hundreds of thousands of our fellow-creatures were slaughtered or burnt at the stake. Again, referring to the Greek dictionary, we find that the word heresy comes from *hairesis*, a sect, and means also "a choosing," "a taking to oneself;" therefore, we may say that in its original signification the name of heretic describes one who has *chosen* his religion, and is thus distinguished from such who have only inherited theirs. In considering the way in which the word was, in the first instance, used in connection with Christianity, we have a curious example of how, in the lapse of time, a word may come to change its meaning, and be applied in exactly an opposite sense to the original use of it. Thus, in Acts xxiv. 6, it was employed by the lawyer, Tertullus, in the accusation made against the Apostle Paul before Ananias, the high priest, in which he was called a "ringleader of the sect (*hairesis*) of the Nazarenes;" viz., the followers of Jesus of Nazareth. The word heresy, thus used so near to the fountain-head of Christianity, was applied only in a general sense, and we may see that Paul afterwards, in his defence before Agrippa, described himself as having been originally of the "strictest sect (*hairesis*) of the Jews," viz., a Pharisee; while, in the former instance of its use, it was as having invented a *new* sect which had excited the people, that the Nazarenes were blamed. Thus, to those who, like Paul and Stephen, were filled with the zeal of converts to the new ideas of God and his relations to mankind, and to those who were most fresh from personal intercourse with Jesus, such as Luke, John, Mark, &c., and whose memories were full of his acts and words—to these the word heresy chanced to be applied, which, after the course of a few centuries, was used

Digitized by Google

as the strongest term of opprobrium by those who had lost sight of the pure source of their faith, and whose Christianity had become a muddied stream, corrupted by mystical dogmas, and superstitious rites and ceremonies. It came to be applied, as we know, all over Europe, as a term of reproach to those who refused to embrace the Christianity of the Romish Church: and whether these were Jews or Protestants, the refusal was ever followed by cruel persecutions. Would a Jew, of the 15th century, in Spain or Italy, have been listened to, who, in becoming the victim of the Inquisition, might have remonstrated with his persecutors, and exclaimed—"This word heresy, which you cast at me, was once used against the very founders of your religion—it was applied to Paul and Peter, and the other followers of Jesus of Nazareth, who formed but a sect of my religion?" and would the Huguenot or Protestant of the 16th century have been understood had he exclaimed—"You accuse me of heresy, because I desire to return to the heresy of the earliest professors of the Christian faith, who knew nothing of the dogmas and external rites with which you have obscured its simplicity and truth?"

In these days, perhaps, the words "Heretic" and "Heresy" have gone somewhat out of fashion, and have been supplanted by the epithets—"Infidel" and "Infidelity." Those persons are, perhaps, more especially accused of infidelity or unfaithfulness to Christianity who value and endeavour to bring to light the original germs of truth contained in it, which have been lost sight of beneath the after accretions to its growth, and who endeavour to teach that fidelity to its principles is what the world has more need of, than any strictness of faith in its recorded facts. As it has been well and wisely said—"They commit a grave error who regard a man as an infidel because he refuses to acknowledge the truth of certain doctrines which they believe, or fancy they believe, to be true. He only is an infidel, who, from base motives, turns a deaf ear to the voice of truth; and the infidel of infidels is he, who, while professing to 'believe all the articles of the Christian faith,' takes no heed to walk after 'the perfect law of love, summed up for him by his Master.'" * For such, indeed, the severity of condemnation which the ages have attached to the word heretic might render it only a fit term of reproach; but since, in accordance with its original meaning, the name should convey no reproach, but rather the reverse, we may hope that it will come to be cheerfully accepted by all earnest-hearted thinkers who "refuse the evil and *choose* the good," and that the day may arrive when the united sects of Christendom will sing, in a revised Te Deum, "The noble army of Martyrs, Heretics, and Confessors praise Thee!"

OUR OBJECTION TO THE POPULAR THEOLOGY.

By Dr Channing.

WE object to the systems of religion which prevail among us, that they are adverse, in a greater or less degree, to purifying, comforting, and honourable views of God; that they take from us our Father in heaven, and substitute for him a being whom we cannot love if we would, and whom we ought not to love if we

* Henry Attwell in "The Book of Golden Thoughts."

Digitized by Google

could. We object, particularly on this ground, to that system which arrogates to itself the name of Orthodoxy, and which is now industriously propagated through our country. This system, indeed, takes various shapes, but in all it casts dishonour on the Creator. According to its old and genuine form, it teaches that God brings us into life wholly depraved, so that under the innocent features of our childhood is hidden a nature averse to all good, and propense to all evil, a nature which exposes us to God's displeasure and wrath, even before we have acquired power to understand our duties, or to reflect upon our actions. According to a more modern exposition, it teaches that we came from the hands of our Maker with such a constitution, and are placed under such influences and circumstances, as to render certain and infallible the total depravity of every human being from the first moment of his moral agency; and it also teaches, that the offence of the child who brings into life this ceaseless tendency to unmingled crime exposes him to the sentence of everlasting damnation. Now, according to the plainest principles of morality, we maintain that a natural constitution of the mind, unfailingly disposing it to evil and to evil alone, would absolve it from guilt; that to give existence under this condition would argue unspeakable cruelty; and that to punish the sin of this unhappily-constituted child with endless ruin would be a wrong unparalleled by the most merciless despotism.

This system also teaches that God selects from this corrupt mass a number to be saved, and plucks them, by a special influence, from the common ruin; that the rest of mankind, though left without that special grace which their conversion requires, are commanded to repent, under penalty of aggravated woe; and that forgiveness is promised them on terms which their very constitution infallibly disposes them to reject, and in rejecting which they awfully enhance the punishments of hell. These proffers of forgiveness and exhortations of amendment, to beings born under a blighting curse, fill our minds with a horror which we want words to express.

That this religious system does not produce all the effects on character, which might be anticipated we most joyfully admit. It is often, very often, counteracted by nature, conscience, common sense, by the general strain of Scripture, by the mild example and precepts of Christ, and by the many positive declarations of God's universal kindness and perfect equity. But still, we think that we see its unhappy influence. It tends to discourage the timid, to give excuses to the bad, to feed the vanity of the fanatical, and to offer shelter to the bad feelings of the malignant. By shocking, as it does, the fundamental principles of morality, and by exhibiting a severe and partial Deity, it tends strongly to pervert the moral faculty, to form a gloomy, forbidding, and servile religion, and to lead men to substitute censoriousness, bitterness, and persecution for a tender and impartial charity. We think, too, that this system, which begins with degrading human nature, may be expected to end in pride; for pride grows out of a consciousness of high distinction, however obtained, and no distinction is so great as that which is made between the elected and abandoned of God.

The false and dishonourable views of God, which have now been stated, we feel ourselves bound to resist unceasingly. Other errors we can pass over with comparative indifference. But we ask our opponents to leave to us a GOD worthy of our love and trust, in whom our moral sentiments may delight, in whom our weaknesses and sorrows may find refuge. We

Digitized by Google

cling to the Divine perfections. We meet them everywhere in creation, we read them in the Scriptures, we see a lovely image of them in Jesus Christ; and gratitude, love, and veneration, call on us to assert them. Reproached, as we often are, by men, it is our consolation and happiness that one of our chief offences is the zeal with which we vindicate the dishonoured goodness and recititude of God.

THE BEGINNING OF RIGHT VIEWS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

IT is now generally acknowledged by those who allow themselves, in reading the Bible, to apply their reason to it in the same manner that they do to any other book, that no part of the Jewish law, as we now have it, was written before the reign of Solomon. It had been called the Mosaic law, and hence had arisen the popular opinion that the first five books, called the Pentateuch, had been written by Moses himself. So firmly and so religiously was this opinion held, that scholars did not open their eyes to the clear evidence to the contrary. Now, however, that the truth has dawned upon us, we naturally inquire who first discovered it.

Benedict de Spinosa, a most remarkably enlightened man, a Jew, born at Amsterdam in 1692, was the first person who published to the world his opinion that the Pentateuch could not have been written by Moses. Spinosa may not have been the first person to have discovered this, but he was the first to publish it to the world. It required some courage to do so. It brought upon him much social persecution; and had he not been living in the free Protestant city of Amsterdam, it might easily have cost him his life. Whatever scholars had formed the same opinion before his time had held their tongue, and had kept the discovery to themselves. That there had been one such scholar, Spinosa found out in a very remarkable way.

Aben Ezra was a celebrated Jewish Rabbi, born in Spain in 1099. Among his other works he wrote a Commentary on the Pentateuch. And in this Commentary appears the following disjointed sentence:—

"Beyond Jordan, ... provided thou understand the mystery of the Twelve; . . . . also, that Moses wrote the Law . . . . whilst the Canaanites were in the land . . . . it will be revealed on the mountain of God. . . . . Then also behold this bed, his bed of iron; . . . . then knowest thou the truth."

To most persons these words would convey no meaning whatever, but not so to Spinosa. He remarks upon them that they contain the evidence that Aben Ezra had discovered that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses, although he never ventured to proclaim that discovery. They refer to five important passages in the Pentateuch. Thus (1) we read in Deuteronomy i. 5: "Beyond the Jordan, in the land of Moab." This, of course, could not have been written by Moses, because Moses never crossed the Jordan; the Jordan never lay between Moses and the land of Moab. This interesting circumstance is not shown in the English Authorised Version. *It is concealed by a false translation;* and we there read: "On this side Jordan, in the land of Moab."

Digitized by Google

(2.) In Deuteronomy xxvii. and Joshua viii. the law of Moses is ordered to be written upon twelve stones, which law, therefore, was much shorter than the Pentateuch, and perhaps confined to the Ten Commandments only. This, says Spinosa, may be the mystery of the Twelve; or, possibly, it may mean the last twelve verses in Deuteronomy, which contain the account of Moses's death.

(3.) We read in Deuteronomy xxxi. 9: "Moses wrote this law, and delivered it." These words are clearly by a later writer, giving an account of the doings of Moses.

(4.) In Genesis xii. 6, we are told that when Abraham came into the country, "the Canaanite was then in the land." This, of course, was written at some time after Joshua's conquest, when the Canaanite was no longer in the land. Upon which Aben Ezra remarks that he who discovers what this means had better keep silence.

(5.) The mountain spoken of in Genesis xxii. 14, where the will of Jehovah is to be revealed, could not have been so spoken of till after the Temple had been built by Solomon, or, as we may say, till after the altar had been placed there by David.

(6.) Og's iron bedstead, which Deuteronomy iii. tells us was to be found in the city of Rabbah, could not have been there found until that city had been captured by David.

In this interesting way does the sagacious Spinosa satisfy himself that Aben Ezra had discovered that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses. For this, however, we owe little thanks to the learned but cautious Aben Ezra. The world must thank not the man who makes a discovery, but the man who, like the brave Spinosa, publishes it.

SAMUEL SHARPE.

EASTERN MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.

UNDER this heading, at page 187 of your interesting monthly publication, you state that "a treacherous man will give orders to his servants, in hostility to the friend who is sitting on the same sofa with him." The following circumstances, which took place in Cairo a few years ago, bear out your statement so exactly that I am induced to send you this account of them.

A Chief or Sheikh of a powerful tribe of Arabs inhabiting the Peninsula of Mount Sinai, who was tributary to the then Basha or Viceroy of Egypt, had, in some way, shown himself careless respecting the safety of certain travellers to whom the Basha had given a firman or passport. No direct notice was taken of the offence; but, after a time, he was summoned to Cairo to make new conditions, as it was supposed, respecting his future tenure of office as chief Sheikh of the district; in fact, however, to get rid of him entirely as a rebellious chief. For this purpose great caution was necessary, for the wily Sheikh was himself an adept in the art of governing in the oriental style. It was therefore arranged that on his arrival he should be treated by the servants of the Court with considerable ceremony, and, on entering the chamber of audience or salamlik, to kiss the hand of the Basha, he was invited to take his place on the same sofa, and next to the Basha. After the usual complimentary phrases, coffee was brought, and, according to custom, the first cup was handed to the Basha. The bearer of the second cup, intended for the Sheikh, slipped on the polished

Digitized by Google

marble floor, spilling the coffee and breaking the cup; immediately the Basha presented his own cup to the Sheikh, and presently a second cup was brought to the Basha; by this contrivance the Sheikh was put off his guard, he even considered it a mark of peculiar condescension on the part of the Basha, and sipped the coffee with more than ordinary delight. While on his journey home, however, he was suddenly taken ill, and died before he reached the encampment of his tribe in Wady Feiran.

Another story, similar to the one just related, was reported to me on the spot a few days only after it had happened.

On the occasion of a grand fête at Shubra, a few miles north of Cairo, it happened that some members of a tribe of Arabs, encamped in the neighbourhood, had stolen some valuable coffee-cups and amber mouth-pieces. The Viceroy was made acquainted with the robbery and with the suspicions entertained as to the robbers. The chief of the tribe was sent for, and commanded by the Basha to bring the thieves, the cups, and the mouth-pieces to the salamlik before sunset. Immediately the chief rode off to the encampment, and, after some trouble, discovered that his own nephews were the culprits. The consequence of denouncing his own brother's children before the Basha would have been an endless quarrel of retribution in the tribe, endangering his own life; so, without delay, he galloped off to the market in Cairo, bought two light complexioned Galla slaves who could not speak a word of Arabic, dressed them up in the dress of his tribe, and took them, together with the cups and mouth-pieces, to Shubra, where he arrived shortly after sunset. The chief advanced into the salamlik, and spreading on the floor the stolen property, pointed out to the Basha the slaves standing at the entrance. The Basha, in a few minutes, after examining the cups and mouth-pieces, made a motion with his hand. Shortly aferwards the two innocent Gallas were headless corpses. The mention of the motion of the hand of the Basha will not fail to remind those who read your valuable periodical, with befitting attention, of a passage in the Psalms (cxxiii. v. 2): "Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress, so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God until that He have mercy upon us." Or, as this verse is more faithfully rendered in "A revision of the authorised English Old Testament:"

Lo, as servants' eyes are on the hand of their masters,
As a maiden's eyes are on the hand of her mistress,
So our eyes shall be on Jehovah our God
Until that He have pity upon us.

DR KALISCH ON THE LEVITICAL LAW.

3. In Deuter. xii. 6, the people are commanded to bring to the national sanctuary, and to no other place, their "burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, their tithes and "heave-offerings, their vows and free-will offerings, and the firstlings of their herds "and flocks:" now, Mr Sharpe argues, that "as no directions are given as to what "these offerings are to be, we have a very clear reference to the Book of Leviticus, "where all these offerings are explained at length." A very clear reference? Because no explanations are given in Deuteronomy, they must be looked for in Leviticus! Why just in Leviticus? Were not burnt and thank-offerings, and all the other enumerated gifts familiar to the Hebrews from early times, and almost from the very commencement of their religious organisation? The passage referred to would have some weight if the list included the latest class of sacrifice, the sin-offerings, and

Digitized by Google

mentioned them in anything like the systematic manner of the fourth chapter of Leviticus; then, indeed, we might seriously consider the question, whether "that por-"tion of Leviticus, at least, was not written before the end of Josiah's reign." But, had this been the case, the command upon which the Deuteronomist insists with so much emphasis would have been superfluous; for it would have been implied in that other and much more comprehensive injunction of Leviticus, which ordained that *all* animals, even those intended for food, were to be killed at the common sanctuary (Lev. xvii. 3-6.) The Deuteronomist did not venture to impose upon the people a burden which the Levitical legislators enforced with the dread penalty of excision; and he endeavoured, by appeals to the people's charity and compassion, to shield from want an indigent priesthood, to which the middle Books, by distinct laws, secured a princely income.

4. Mr Sharpe's next argument is fairly perplexing: because, according to 2 Chron. xxxi. 14, the Levite Kore, the son of Imnah, was, by King Hezekiah, entrusted with the distribution of the free-will offerings and the most holy things (for which office he was fully qualified even by the latest and most rigorous laws of the Pentateuch), therefore—so argues Mr Sharpe—the narrative in Numbers xvi. concerning the rebellion of Korah, the son of Izhar, was written during the reign of Hezekiah, in displeasure, with clear reference to that "unpopular" appointment. It is difficult to see the logic and cogency of such reasoning. Granted that the Chronist's specified statement is a "historic fact," how could that appointment annoy "the priests, who "called themselves Sons of Aaron"? Need I remind Mr Sharpe that even in Deuteronomy, that is, even in Josiah's time, the functions of priests and Levites were not yet clearly distinguished, and that all sacredotal ministrations were performed by the whole tribe alike; that, therefore, in that Book, the priests were never called "Sons of Aaron," but "the priests the Levites," or "the priests the Sons of Levi"? Hence the Deuteronomist never denounced Korah's demands as rebellious; for, in his eyes, the Levite Korah was entitled to all the priestly privileges. It is only in the middle Books that we see the priesthood absolutely restricted to "the sons of "Aaron;" and not before this arrangement was proposed or finally insisted upon could the hierarchical party brand the aspirations of Korah and his followers as seditious and blasphemous.

5. The case is different with respect to Dathan and Abiram, the Reubenites. In the time of the Deuteronomist the men of Levi, scattered through the whole land, were commonly recognised as the ministers and teachers of the people; and if any other tribe, were it even that descended from the first-born Reuben, claimed a participation in the same honoured offices, it was deemed guilty of impious usurpation (Deut. xi. 6.) Suppose even that the story about the budding rod of Aaron was first conceived at that period merely with a view of impressing the superior sanctity of the tribe of Levi, yet it is impossible to doubt, both from the form in which that story is told in Numbers, and from the place which it there occupies, that it was used by the compiler of the Book to illustrate the elevation of Aaron as the spiritual chief of the nation: for he introduced Aaron's name repeatedly and with evident emphasis as the representative of the Levites, and he inserted the miracle immediately after the catastrophe of the Korahites to serve as a confirmation of the special favour enjoyed by the Aaronites above all other branches of their tribe. The narrative about Dathan and Abiram is indeed older than that about Korah; but the latter, as we have seen, carries us very far beyond the reign of Josiah, into an age when priestly influence was paramount and all-powerful.

I have now reviewed a large portion of Mr Sharpe's arguments, and I fear I have already taxed too much both your space and the patience of your readers. I will, therefore, conclude with assuring you that, after a careful consideration of all points, I can see no reason for changing the views at which I have arrived after long, and, I may add, anxious investigation. I am fully convinced that an intelligible and organic history of the chief institutions of the Hebrews, such as I have attempted in my two volumes on Leviticus, cannot possibly be constructed on the supposition that Deuteronomy is the latest Book of the Pentateuch

But the divergence between Mr Sharpe's opinions and those which I advocate is fortunately not very considerable: he admits that chapters xviii to xxvii. of Leviticus were written after the return from the Captivity; respecting the date of the Ceremonial Laws in general, he claims for his arguments, not the force of conclusive proofs, but merely a certain degree of probability; and what is still more important, he examines and treats the Scriptural records in that true spirit of historic enquiry, the manly candour and consistency of which cannot fail to promote Biblical criticism in general, and thus to open men's minds for a higher conception of religious truth.—I am, &c.,

M. Kalisch.

London, Dec. 12, 1872.

Digitized by Google

NOTES ON THE BIBLE.

THE FOUR KINGS DEFEATED BY ABRAHAM.

WE could not perhaps do better, in explaining to our readers how some parts of the Bible were written, than ask them to read carefully Genesis xiv. 1–16. But they must read it with a map, if they would understand it. Here the King of Shinar or Babylonia, the King of Ellasar or Assyria, the King of Elam, on the east of Babylonia, and the King of Nations, make war upon five little towns or villages on the shores of the Dead Sea. These four Kings hold a mighty territory, as large as that held by Sennacherib when he attacked Hezekiah, King of Jerusalem. The five little towns, for some years, pay a tribute to these great Kings, but in the thirteenth year they rebel. Then in the fourteenth year the four great Kings again come down upon the five little towns, and, of course, easily conquer them, and retire with their booty.

When Abraham heard of what had happened, he drew out his three hundred and eighteen servants, pursued the four Kings, and routed their large armies with his handful of men, near Damascus, and brought safely back the prisoners and the booty.

Now, we may safely say that this was written in the reign of Hezekiah. Sennacherib, as we read in 2 Kings xviii., had, in the same way, in the fourteenth year, come up against Hezekiah, with armies drawn from the above-mentioned provinces. The Jews, while the danger lasted, by no means thought lightly of it; but, when he retreated, they ventured to speak mockingly of him. This narrative was written in ridicule of his retreat. That it should be a real history is impossible. The magnitude of the invading powers, and the trifling force that defeats them, show that it was meant for a fiction. That being the case, we can have no difficulty in determining both when and why it was written. S. S.

THE SINNER'S END.

THERE are persons who will have it that a great improvement has taken place in the manner of bringing religion home to the minds of the thoughtless. We do not believe it. A tract, called the *Monthly Visitor*, December 1872, is before us, and of which, we suppose, copies have been distributed throughout Scotland. It is called "The Sinner's End," by Rev. C. H. Spurgeon. We do not say that the whole tract is bad, because it is possible to find an occasional remark worthy of approval; but, with this acknowledgement, we must characterise the publication as an insult to man, and blasphemous in its references to God. It contains a conceited assumption of knowledge as to the details of the torture which will be visited upon the poor unfortunate sinner. We are told that "God knoweth that the dying repose of sinners is but the awful calm before the eternal hurricane." Then we are told of the struggles of dying men—all designed to alarm and terrify those weak enough to be affected. Here is another extract:—"It is *your* end I speak

Digitized by Google

of now—*yours*, ye sons of godly mothers, ye daughters of holy parents—*your* end, unless God give you repentance." Again, "I have the solemn conviction that there are scores and hundreds of you who are on the road to hell." We are sometimes asked what we think of such intemperate language. We answer—the Christianity of Jesus knows nothing of it. Instead of leading the careless to love piety and God, such descriptions of hell and vengeance only bring religion itself into contempt.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL:

Outline Lessons on John the Baptist.

No. II.—His Work.

Object—To teach that true repentance, *i.e.*, sorrow for sins, and an earnest endeavour to overcome them, are a necessary preparation for the kingdom of heaven.

Text—"Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Scripture Readings—*(a)* Luke xvii. 20 to 21; *(b)* Luke iii. 1 to 9; *(c)* 10 to 14; *(d)* 15 to 18.

(a) The kingdom of God—of Heaven—not an earthly or outward kingdom, but the reign of God within our hearts, when He is very near to us, and our whole souls are guided by an implicit confidence in His wisdom and loving obedience to His laws. (Refer to Rev. iii. 20.) It was this kingdom Jesus came to establish.

(b) The expectation by the Jews of the reign of Messiah on earth. It is probable John shared this belief, but he knew that, even for such an event, much less great and glorious as it would be than a heavenly kingdom, the people would not be fitted while they remained in such a state of moral degradation and religious indifference.

2d. "The word of God." How did John respond? Speak of every conviction that a thing is wrong, every pure thought, every noble resolve being a call from God. What may we learn from John's example? 3d. The baptism of repentance; true sorrow for sin cleansing the soul as water the body, thereby causing remission or putting away of sin. 4th. The fruits of repentance to be found in uprightness and honesty in the commonest concerns of life; that to enter the kingdom of heaven we must not rely upon the merits of another; *we* must be faithful as well as Abraham—must, ourselves, walk with God, remembering always that only the pure in heart can see Him.

(c) The simplicity of John's rules of preparation for the kingdom of heaven. Speak of our frequent unwillingness to perform faithfully an apparently small and mean duty, while we desire to do something grand and important.

(d) The necessity of the destruction of evil for the establishment of the kingdom of heaven. The baptism of the Holy Spirit—when the love of God so abides in the heart that no thought of self can remain there, when every thing is done to and for Him, and the meanest duties become ennobled, and all trials and sorrows glorified, and the whole life is hid with Christ in God.

Florence Gregg.

Digitized by Google

GREEK TESTAMENT CLASS.

FOURTEENTH LESSON.

WE have now another task for our pupils, which will teach them to find the Verbs clear and easy. Let them make a great chart of the Tense-endings of a Verb in ω. Those who condescend to take help, may get the Greek chart advertised on our outside cover, and copy that; but let the enterprising make one for themselves, copying the Endings from their own Grammar, and we will show them how to begin.

Take a large sheet of cartridge drawing-paper, using the long sides for top and bottom. Crease it in half by laying the two long sides together. Then opening it again, head the upper half ACTIVE, and the lower half (writing close under the crease) PASSIVE. Next rule a line parallel with the crease, but two inches above it, and close under this line, write MIDDLE.

Now, across the horizontal lines, divide the paper from top to bottom into eight perpendicular columns; and beginning at the left hand—Take the *first column* for the Names of Tenses, as Lesson Eight shows in the Active, and let each Name down this column stand for the name of all the Tenses on the same level with it all across the paper (which will be one tense in each mood). Take the *second column* for the Root of the Verb, the Characteristic, the Augment, and the Reduplication. And each of the *remaining six columns* head with the name of a mood, thus—INDICATIVE, SUBJUNCTIVE, OPTATIVE, IMPERATIVE, INFINITIVE, PARTICIPLES; to head each mood running down through all three Voices.

Lastly, divide these six right-hand colums into spaces ready for the tenses, by ruling horizontal lines across the paper on a line with the name of the tense. In the PASSIVE there will be *nine*, but only *six* in the ACTIVE, because there the Roots of the Imperfect and 2 Aorist are to be bracketed together against only one set of endings; and so also the two Perfects, and so also the two Pluperfects; the contracted Future is to be omitted. The MIDDLE has space ready for only *one*, namely, the 1 Aorist, as its other tenses can be found in the Passive.

And now the Paradigm in the Grammar will give the rest; taking care, whenever one set of endings is the same for many tenses, as in the Subjunctive of the Active, to write it only the once, because it is very well to show by empty spaces where there is nothing fresh to learn.

Below we give a good hearty text for fearless honesty and speaking out the truth we may have received.

Matt. x. 27.

Ὁ	λεγω	ὑμιν	εν	τῃ	σκοτιᾳ,	ειπατε	εν	τῳ	φωτι·
That which	I say	to you	in	the	dark,	speak ye	in	the	light;
και	ὁ	εις	το	ους	ακουετε,	κηρυξατε	επι	των	δωματων.
and	that which	into	the	ear	ye hear	proclaim ye	upon	the	housetops.
Και	μη	φοβεισθε	απο	των	αποκτενοντων	το	σωμα,	την	
And	not	be ye frightened	at	the [people]	killing	the	body,	the	
δε	ψυχην	μη	δυναμενων	αποκτειναι·	φοβηθητε	δε	μαλλον		
but	soul	not	being able	to kill;	be ye frightened	but	rather [at]		
τον	δυναμενον	και	ψυχην	και	σωμα	απολεσαι	εν	γεεννῃ.	
the [One]	being able	both	soul	and	body	to kill	in	gehenna.	

Digitized by Google

WHY WE ARE UNITARIANS.

A LETTER TO THE YOUNG.

My dear Children,—I told you last month about some of the Dissenters, now I will tell you about the set or sect that we belong to. It is called the Unitarians. We have not made any of these rules, we leave every one to think for himself, and we tell every one that he ought to think for himself; we believe in the power of truth, and that we ought to try and find out what truth is. Read the Bible, read all good books that you can get hold of, talk to every one you can, who is wiser than yourself, then think it all over and make up your own mind, and never be weary of seeking for knowledge which may teach you the truth.

The Church people and the other Dissenters do not at all approve of our setting aside all their rules, and they tell us we are in danger of going to hell when we die. But as we feel very safe in God's goodness, and that there is no hell to go to, we do not mind their saying so; for it does not usually prevent their being very good to us now before we die.

Sometimes Unitarians have got into trouble because of their opinions, perhaps some of you children may. When you see the trouble coming, if you are cowards you will say, "Oh! I am not a Unitarian, I belong to the Church, or to the other Dissenters." But if you are brave, if you are worth anything, you will never give up what you believe to be true for the sake of any worldly advantage whatever. Give up your opinions as soon as ever you know them to be false, but stand by the truth manfully, so that you may be worthy to be counted among the noble army of martyrs who have suffered for conscience sake. And you will find in this matter as in many others that twenty dangers will threaten you before one comes that hurts you.

After hearing all this, I think you are glad to remember that you are a Protestant, a Dissenter, and a Unitarian. I hope you will never give up your liberty of conscience, nor your right of private judgment, for those are two things that a Protestant Dissenter holds most dear. And I hope you will never try to force your opinions upon others, for in doing *that*, both the Catholics and the Protestants did a grievous wrong.

Remember the text that says, "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good," and act upon it to the best of your knowledge. As long as you live, children, remember that text.

Now, in order that you may know what good service the Dissenters have done in England, I have copied out for you a paragraph from a book written by a Frenchman. He tells of the troubles in his own country, and just says a few words to show how much better off the English were at that time. It was written before the dreadful war that they have just had, which, of course, makes them worse off than before.

Read it, and remember to live so that every action of yours may help to keep up the high character that the Dissenters have gained for England.

"In England, the people at large (from 1830 to 1853), were peaceably disposed; "from a sensible and clear understanding of their real interests, from inclination for "the productive activity which peace engenders, and from a true Christian principle. "Religious convictions are not with them mere rules for private conduct, or simply "intellectual indulgences; they enter into political life, and influence the actions of "public men as conscience weighs upon simple individuals. The dissenting sects are

Digitized by Google

"generally the first who stir themselves energetically for some object, which, in "their eyes, religion commands them to pursue. The movement soon extends "through the entire Christian Church of the country, then into the different classes "of civil society, and finally reaches the Government itself, which either coincides "from approbation, or resigns itself to follow. Thus the traffic in slaves has been "abolished, thus the spirit of peace (until the last few years), has predominated in "England, gathering power at once from the wisdom of material interests and the "force of religious convictions, and imposed by the nation upon the Government, "which, on its part, during the progress of this interval, has not repulsed this public "feeling, but has voluntarily adopted it as the rule of state policy."—*Guizot's "Memoirs of my own Time."*

TRUTH AN INTUITION.

Once leave your own knowledge of God, your own sentiments, and take secondary knowledge, as St Paul's, or George Fox's, or Swedenborg's, and you get wider from God with every year this secondary form lasts; and as now for centuries, the chasm yawns to that breadth that men can scarcely be convinced there is in them anything divine. Let me admonish you, first of all, to go alone, to refuse the good models, even those which are sacred in the imaginations of men, and dare to love God without mediator or veil. The man on whom the soul descends, through whom the soul speaks, alone can teach. But the man who aims to speak as books enable, as synods use, as the fashion guides, and as interest commands, babbles. Let him hush. Whilst the doors of the temple stand open night and day before every man, and the oracles of truth cease never, it is guarded by one stern condition: this, namely—it is an intuition. It cannot be received at second hand. Truly speaking, it is not *instruction*, but *provocation*, that I can receive from another soul. What he announces, I must find in me or reject; and on his word, or as his second, be he who he may, I can accept nothing. On the contrary, the absence of primary faith is the presence of degradation.—*R. W. Emerson.*

NOTES OF PROGRESS.

SCOTLAND.

Dundee.—Public attention is again directed to the Rev. W. Knight, whose paper on "Prayer," in the *Contemporary Review*, is to be examined by a Committee appointed by Mr Knight's Presbytery for that purpose. Mr Knight shows no disposition to remain quiet. The so-called persecutors are very unpopular. Regarded from the Unitarian stand-point the agitation is but a sign of a growing dissatisfaction with the old orthodoxy, which, having offered for men's worship a God of vengeance and severity, has long succeeded in making its devotees crouch and cringe like poor slaves before a tyrant. Mr Knight regards as the key-note of all prayer "Thy will be done." But for this men must believe in a Father "who is good unto all, and whose tender mercies are over all his works." We have yet to learn that the Free (?) Church has reached this position. We think Mr Knight has.

The Congregationalists.—Aside from the trust-deeds of their chapels, which we suppose, in most cases, are orthodox, there seems a growing tendency on the part of the Congregationalists to take up a position nearer ourselves. Some time ago the representatives of a Dundee congregation avowed their Universalism. This is a great step in advance; and with it no doubt there are other changes coming over the minds of those who profess to have no definite creed. A Congregationalist minister is reported to have lately said, that it was an impossibility for Jesus to have been God. The orthodoxy of some of the liberal party hangs almost altogether upon a hazy notion about the Divinity of Jesus, which seems to us neither one thing nor the other. We shall watch the progress of the Congregationalists with the deepest interest. They are possibly most free to adopt a simpler faith and a more generous hope.

Edinburgh.—A correspondent of the *Daily Review* remarks that the Edinburgh Presbytery have allowed Dr Wallace to preach, what the correspondent regards as, Unitarian doctrines. No wonder that Edinburgh Unitarians, without zeal, attend the church of Dr Wallace.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google